

Christian Order

Property of
Graduate Theological Union

FEB 19 1988

FEMINISM IN

LONELY SHEP

RENEW: BUILD
CHURCH

THE MASS IS THE THING

UNIVERSITY AND CHURCH

MORE ON EVOLUTION

1988

John Mole, O.M.I.

David Cronley, O.P.

Australian Leaflet

The Editor

James V. Schall, S.J.

Sylvester Marshall

PLEASE

Let me thank so very much all those who have renewed so promptly and so generously their subscriptions that were due in December. We still have some way to go with the December subscriptions and the January reminders have just been sent out. These are the two big months for subscriptions and the *minute* staff we have at what passes for an Office, where *Christian Order* is concerned, has been under the heaviest kind of pressure and working overtime constantly and with great pleasure to try and give readers the best possible service at this time of the year. What we need above all is prompt and generous renewal of subscriptions. I say no more. You know me so well. Let me thank you more than I can say and wish you all conceivable New Year Blessings. Pray for me, please.

— Paul Crane, S.J.

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page

- 2 NEW YEAR RESOLVE *The Editor*
- 4 FEMINISM IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH *Fr. John W. Mole, OMI*
- 14 RENEW: BUILDING A PEOPLE'S CHURCH
Australian Leaflet
- 20 THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH: 5 THE MASS IS THE THING
The Editor
- 29 UNIVERSITY AND CHURCH
James V. Schall, S.J.
- 39 LONELY SHEPHERD
Placid Croney, O.P.
- 51 MORE ON EVOLUTION
Sylvester Marshall
- 61 BOOK REVIEWS *Paul Crane, S.J.*

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada

India, etc.—£10, \$20

Australia—£12, \$25

New Zealand—£12, \$25

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 29

JANUARY

NO. 1

New Year Resolve

THE EDITOR

WRITING in *The Times* (23/10/87) of the widening split which was manifesting itself more sharply than usual in the Church of England in the days prior to its last Synod, particularly in the matter of sexual aberration, Clifford Longley, *The Times* Religious Correspondent, set down with striking clarity, what might be described as the nub of the differing points of view that separate those on either side of the divide within the Anglican Church today.

“On the one hand”, wrote Longley, “are those for whom the essence of Christianity is revelation: that God has disclosed once and for all the moral rules by which mankind must conduct itself, and all arguments must fall silent in the presence of His Word”. He then makes his essential distinction some lines further down in the same article: “On the other side, Christianity is seen as a process of discovery, a journey through history, and all its inherited teachings must be measured against contemporary experience and later knowledge”.

I imagine the reader will know what I am getting at. Include within both sides of the argument doctrinal teaching, as well as that which is moral, and you arrive at once at the widening split, which besets the Catholic Church today. I have described it before as lying between those who believe in the divinity of Christ Our Lord and hold logically and of necessity to His Revelation and the supreme author-

ity of His divinely founded One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. This, on the one hand. On the other hand, those Catholics who have drifted and are drifting from that belief. For those who believe so rightly in the Divinity of Christ Our Lord, the Catholic Church, founded by Christ Who was God must, of necessity, be God-centered. God's truth is there totally within it. Of necessity, it claims and must have the whole of the allegiance of those who believe, as true Catholics believe, that Christ was God. It cannot be otherwise and remain of God; therefore God-centered.

Where the Catholic Church is seen, not as God-centered, but alterable in the supposed interests of man, one can be sure that, somewhere along the line, belief in the divinity of Christ Our Lord, of His Revelation and the Catholic Church He founded, together with the Supreme Authority that governs His Church, have gone as well. All options, in consequence, are open to those who would refashion that Church with a view to setting it in the image of man. It is precisely this process which is now well under way in what was once Western Christendom. It is precisely this process which now threatens the once flourishing Catholic Church of the developing world. The mood and the move is now for a man-made world religion to replace that which alone is true because totally of God and, in consequence, totally God-centered. In the van of this move are the progressive revolutionaries; for the most part, clerics high and low and Religious. Their hope — certain to be proved vain — is that what they think of as a "religion of mankind", based on vague, consensus round a lowest-common-denominator of shoddy secularist belief, will supplant that set by Christ on the rock that is Peter.

The hope, as I have just remarked, will be proved vain, but not without a struggle; in all probability, quite likely to match that which beset the Church at the time of the Arian heresy. This thought should not daunt us. This is no time for faint hearts. In the words of St. Paul, let us resolve this New Year to "hold fast to that which is good" with the courage that perseveres and never takes No for an answer; above all, with prayer, especially to the Mother of God in this her Marian Year.

We are happy to reproduce below the first part of a two-part article, which embodies an Address given on May 2nd, 1987 at Victoria, British Columbia, Canada by Father John Mole, O.M.I. to an audience made up of members of "Women for Life, Faith and Family". In this Address Father Mole goes to the roots of his subject, "Feminism in the Catholic Church", in a manner, which, in my own view, has never been equalled.

Feminism in the Catholic Church

FATHER JOHN W. MOLE, O.M.I.

WHEN I got on my plane to fly here yesterday, I tried to compose my mind with the pleasant thought of how nice it is to be invited to Victoria in the month of May when the trees are in blossom. But into my mind came instead a rather sombre memory of when I last flew into Victoria, some years ago, in a military helicopter en route from Comox Airforce Base. This happened towards the end of a seven-year period, which lasted up to 1981, when I served as a reservist chaplain in the Canadian Armed Forces. As such, I spent a few months each year relieving regular chaplains. I flew from base to base, from Prince Edward Island to Vancouver Island, and was only on a particular base for a few weeks at a time. It turned out to be the missionary phase of my career for I tried to do what Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate are noted for, and were founded for: going from place to place preaching the Word of God. And thanks to this experience, I was enabled to found the programme of adult catechesis based on Scripture readings for each Sunday called the WORD OF GOD HOUR and which extends over a three-year cycle of the ABC Lectionary.

From Comox, I would normally have taken the Military Transport plane that leaves every other day, flying first to

Vancouver and thence to various bases across Canada. But on this occasion, having some free time, I decided to visit friends in Victoria prior to catching a later flight from Vancouver. As it happened, I was offered a lift to Victoria in a helicopter flown by a French-Canadian crew just out from eastern Canada and hence somewhat inexperienced with the topography and weather patterns in these parts. Well, we all got more experience than we bargained for on this particular flight.

The weather was fine as we flew down the east coast of Vancouver Island as far as Nanaimo, where we turned inland and began to follow the Saanich Inlet which leads right to the eastern end of the city of Victoria. Shortly after we entered the Saanich Inlet the sky fell down, dark and heavy, below the tops of the ridges on each side. And there we were flying in a tunnel that twisted and narrowed as we went. I had earphones on, thanks to which I could hear the remarks of the pilot both to his co-pilot and to the contral tower at Victoria Airport on the Saanich Peninsula to our left and so knew that the weather was clear at the airport and that, being Saturday morning, there was considerable traffic in the way of light, private aircraft. And this prompted my pilot to report to the control tower at intervals that flying conditions over, or rather in the Inlet, were very bad. He was anxious lest on turning a corner, he might find an aircraft coming at him from the opposite direction. Suddenly, on rounding a bend, we did find a formidable obstacle in our path — the power lines that cross the Inlet near Mount Malahat. My pilot reacted in time to dive under them, remarking as he did: *Mon Dieu, c'est dangereux ici!* My God, it's dangerous round here! Fortunately, when we had gone the length of the inlet, or of the misty tunnel which it had become, there was light at the end of it. We rose out of it thankfully and flew to the Esquimault naval base where they put me down.

And as I travelled westwards yesterday, methought here I am, flying once more to Victoria, and once more in poor visibility and on a mission which angels would find appalling, namely to adress the difficult problem posed to the Church by those who seek to feminize the role of the priesthood of Our Lord notwithstanding that He has instituted it

as a masculine role. They are waging a campaign which is becoming ever more vociferous and which, only last October, was escalated by an assembly of feminists at Washington much bigger than two others they held in 1975 and 1978. What can be said or done about it, apart from praying: Lord, let there be light at the end of this tunnel and let it be soon.

The swarming of feminists at Washington, 2,500 of them, included delegations sent from Canada, expenses paid. They included leading ladies of the Catholic Women's League in whose bonnets the bees have been buzzing ever since.

A professional firm was hired to make sure that the buzzing of the Washington swarm would be heard throughout the length and breadth of North America. All that was seen and heard at this Assembly was distributed on video-cassettes, etc. in great profusion. And the buzz word sent forth was: "the paradigm shift".

"THE PARADIGM SHIFT"

Paradigm (p-a-r-a-d-i-g-m) comes from the Greek noun *paradigma* which means "model". Model comes from the Latin '*modus*'. Apparently, now that Latin is unfashionable, if one wants to be "with it", one speaks Greek. Anyway, if you hear that someone is going to talk, say in your parish hall, on the subject of "doing the paradigm shift" (as happened, I notice, recently in a parish of Victoria) it simply means "changing to a new model". Come to think of it, we have long been habituated to "doing the paradigm shift" by the automobile industry which, every year, spends millions of dollars to urge people to turn in their old cars for new models. And when, in these days of easy divorce, the fancy of many not so young men lightly turn to thoughts of exchanging their wives for more recent and more attractive models, they also are "doing the paradigm shift".

What reason do feminists have at present for urging our Holy Mother the Church to do "the paradigm shift?" It is this: as the male model of the Catholic priesthood has lasted for nigh on two thousand years, the time has come to change it for a new model which will embrace us women.

The Holy See replies in its "Declaration on the Question of the Ordination of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood":

"The Church intends to remain faithful to that model of priestly ministry, which the Lord Jesus Christ willed, and which the Apostles maintained" (Part One, 5th par.).

This Declaration was issued on October 15, 1976, in answer to the first swarming of the feminists at Detroit in 1975 who numbered about 1,200, mostly nuns. The feminists in turn responded with a second assembly held at Baltimore in 1978, at which they made a counter-declaration to the effect that they were not interested in being ordained to the Catholic priesthood as it is constituted, because it is an irremediably masculine institution. So, they said, it will have to be radically changed in order to be made acceptable to women. To emphasize this point, they marched through the streets of Baltimore led by banners with the words: New Woman, New Priesthood, New Church. One would judge from this that they were marching out of the Catholic Church and I myself concluded, in my commentary entitled *Womanhood and Priesthood* recorded on Cassette No. 8 of the new educational Blue Kit being prepared for your organization: (I quote) "From then on (i.e. after Baltimore, 1978) the campaign for women priests began to show itself as extraneous to the priesthood and to the Church as founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ". However this latest assembly at Washington in October, 1986, was apparently for the purpose of giving a new impetus to the demand for change within the Church, to address it more to her membership than to her leadership, and to present it under the more enigmatic label of "the paradigm shift".

THE LAMBETH WALK

Presumably it is hoped that "doing the paradigm shift" is going to be a hit with the faithful and will vie in popularity with "doing the Lambeth walk". In saying that I do not wish to be merely facetious but rather to use a striking comparison that is pedagogically useful. "Doing the Lambeth walk" is quite an apt simile for "doing the paradigm shift" for two reasons. The first is that Lambeth Place, the residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury in London, is a sort of Vatican for the Anglican diaspora throughout the world. The Anglican Church of Hong Kong set the prece-

dent of ordaining women early in the 1940's and the Anglican communions of North America began in the 1970's. Their mother Church in England has hitherto refused to follow suit, and Lambeth has withheld its approval. But now the General Synod of the Church of England, at its meeting in February of last year, has voted, 317 to 145, to initiate proceedings leading to the ordination of women. Hence the practice will eventually be sanctioned by Lambeth and all Anglican communions will be united in "doing the Lambeth walk".

The second reason for comparing "the paradigm shift" to "the Lambeth walk" is even more striking. For the song and dance routine in question involves stepping backwards as much as forwards. (I trust you know that and do not expect me to choerograph it for you.) In fact, whether you call it "the Lambeth walk" or the "paradigm shift", the history of the Church shows that it means stepping backwards all the way to the second century. For hardly was the Church one hundred years old when in her midst appeared sects which had women officiating as priests and bishops. It was, as we can suppose, one of those childhood afflictions like measles. The Church broke out in spots when still at a tender age.

THE Gnostic CONNECTION

From certain Fathers of the Church, notably St. Irenaeus, we learn that the practice of ordaining women was peculiar to Gnostic sects. Here let me read to you an excerpt on the subject of Gnosticism from my discourse on "Womanhood and Priesthood" recorded on Cassette No. 8 of the Blue Kit (as the educational programme for Women for Life, Faith and Family is called). No. 8 is a detailed commentary on the Declaration of the Holy See of 1976. This declaration consists of a Prooemium or Introduction, and six parts. The excerpt I read is my commentary on the first part entitled "The Constant Tradition of the Church". It begins: "This first part leads off with the statement that never has the idea entered the Church's head that priestly or episcopal ordination can be conferred validly on women.

"It is true, however, that because of Gnostic movements which infiltrated the Church in her early beginnings, the

phenomenon of women being ordained to the priesthood was occurring, notably in Phrygia, in the second century. But this practice was repudiated by the Fathers.

"Is the present agitation for the ordination of women also inspired by the Gnostic mentality? Undoubtedly, for if the enthusiasts who demand the ordination of women, are asked, 'What if Christ does not will this?' they reply that Christ only spoke for his own time and in the context of the culture to which he belonged. But now we are in a new age, in which a new spirit is urging new ideas. This is a typically Gnostic response.

"It was, in fact, the response of Montanus, a Gnostic leader of the second century who lived in Phrygia. It is surmised (by Mgr. Knox in his book *Enthusiasm*) that he was formerly a priest of the mother-goddess Cybele before he became converted, or half-converted, to Christianity. (Montanus means 'mountain man' which might possibly refer to him as a frequenter of Mount Ida in Phrygia reputed to be the dwelling-place of the Mother-Goddess Cybele.) Montanus had two very influential lady friends, Maximilla and Priscilla, and the three evidently considered themselves as a Holy Trinity. Montanus spoke of himself as the Holy Spirit incarnate and claimed to be able to make new revelations.

"Gnosticism has been a recurring problem in the history of the Church. It existed during the time of the apostles. Both St. John and St. Paul had to contend with it, the former at Ephesus and the later at Colossae in Phrygia. In the Middle Ages, there was a considerable outbreak of it, thanks to the writings of an Italian monk named Joachim of Fiore. . . . (The fanciful motion occurred to him to apply) the symbol of the Trinity to the interpretation of history, thus dividing it into . . . the age of the Father, which came to an end with the birth of Jesus; the age of the Son, which came to an end in Joachim's time, and the age of the Spirit, which is supposed to be the final and perfect era of brotherhood . . . The three ages are in discontinuity with each other.

"Gnosticism has become a raging epidemic in our times, especially in its modern, secular forms like Communism . . .

The Gnostic is not a believer but a knower. He has a direct line of communication with whoever is currently supposed to be determining the course of history, vaguely thought of as the Spirit of the Age. Gnosticism consists, as we can see very clearly from Joachim's kind of speculation, in phantasizing about the meaning of history. It does not regard it as the *continuum* which it is in reality, but as a succession of ages, each of which repudiates the preceding age. The habit of talking about the "post-conciliar church" inspired by "the spirit of Vatican II" in a manner as to be in complete rupture with what is called the "preconciliar church" is an example of the Gnostic mentality. Every age has a new revelation which supplants the revelation of the previous Age. It is of no consequence if Christ in his age neither ordained or willed to ordain women to his priesthood. What was thought in his age is irrelevant in ours. Today there is a new Age and a new Spirit". (End of the excerpt.)

GNOSTICISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY

Now let me call your attention to the crux of the matter regarding Gnosticism and Christianity, that is, to the radical antagonism between the attitude of the Gnostic and that of the Christian. The former relies on what he calls "knowledge" for salvation; and the latter relies on Faith. St. Paul says, "the just man lives by faith". The Gnostics say, No he lives by knowledge. The word "gnostic" comes from the verb *gnoscere* "to know" and connotes knowledge of one's own experience. The Gnostic is a knower of a kind who refuses to believe anything on the authority of another, even if that other be Jesus Christ himself. He only accepts the knowledge or *gnosis* of his own experience and consciousness. So the Gnostic stance is the very antithesis of Faith. We see that clearly in the attitude of a famous Gnostic, Karl Marx. He put at the head of the doctoral thesis which he wrote as a young man the cry of Prometheus, the titan who symbolizes the spirit of materialism in Greek mythology, "I hate all gods". And Marx, according to Eric Voegelin, philosopher of history and the principal authority of today on modern Gnosticism, maintained that man needs no god to save him, and should not therefore

put his faith in a Saviour God. For he can save himself thanks to knowledge, especially the knowledge of scientific technology. Now this fundamental attitude that it is knowledge, not Faith, which saves mankind is common to all Gnostic revolutionary movements, including Feminism of which the constant cry is: "I hate all male gods".

REPUDIATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH (SUBJECTIVELY)

This purpose is at the core of Feminism and is the most hidden part of its agenda. It is probably hidden even to most Feminists. I doubt they are aware that, subjectively, their attitude is one of repudiation of the Christian Faith. Many no doubt are victims of the confusion of the times. From not knowing what to believe, they end up with losing the virtue of Faith itself. So please understand I do not wish to condemn Feminists as a category but rather to analyze the predicament from which they need to be saved. As for moral responsibility, I think that we priests, of high or low degree, should be the first to assume responsibility for the confusion that presently reigns in the Church. The principal conclusion reached by the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops in 1985 was "In the entire world, the transmission of the Faith . . . is in danger". This must mean that we priests are failing to accomplish our mission for teaching the Faith. As for Feminism in the Church, it should be regarded as a phenomenon of the general collapse of the Faith. When a star collapses, we are told it leaves a vortex, a black hole. The axiom that nature abhors a vacuum is surely more true of the spiritual than it is of the physical domain and when it is the star of Faith that collapses in a given region, the most aberrant notions can be expected to rush in to take its place. The situation can only be redressed by those chiefly responsible for causing the light of Faith to shine in the world. Especially in the matter which concerns us here, it devolves on us priests to defend the priesthood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, come what may. Alas, too many are intimidated. Worse still, some are infatuated by the prospect of women priests and are making the confusion worse confounded.

At this point, let us turn to the principal statement of the Declaration of the Holy See concerning the non-eligibility of women for ordination to the Priesthood. This is placed in the Prooemium or Introduction of the Declaration of October 15, 1976, and then elaborated in the six parts which follow. Permit me to quote it first in Latin:

*Ecclesiam quae Domini exemplo fidelis manere intendit
AUCTORITATEM SIBI NON AGNOSCERE admit-
tendi mulieres ad sacerdotalem ordinationem.*

This means: "The Church who intends to remain faithful to the example of the Lord does not know (perceive) herself to be authorized to admit women to priestly ordination". Gnostics are telling the Church she should know that she has power to ordain women. "The Church replies (here I am again quoting from my commentary on WLFF Cassette No. 8). I know of no such power in me. The verb *agnoscere* is a reinforced form of the verb *gnoscere* — to know. In the mystery of the Annunciation, the Blessed Virgin, on being told by the Angel Gabriel that she is to be the mother of our Saviour, asks: *Quomodo* — How shall this be? For I do not *know* man (she speaks of course of the knowledge of experience). Were she to "know man", she would know herself empowered to have a child. But as she does not, nor shall she ever "know man", how can she have a child? And similarly, the Church does not know of any power in her to ordain women. If such power were in her, she would know it. Hence she concludes that Jesus Christ, who is in all ages the author of all her sacraments, does not empower her to ordain women as well as men to the holy priesthood. It is no use trying to ram the idea into her head that she can do what her Lord does not do. She intends to remain faithful to what He has in His head by taking His example as her guide". (End of quotation.)

The *non agnoscere* attributed to the Church in the statement by the Holy See, that is, her stand that she does not know of any power in her to ordain women, indicates the contrast between the mind of the Church, which is imbued by Faith, and the Gnostic mentality which repudiates Faith. The Feminist says to the Church: you should know that

you have power to ordain me. The Church says I know of no such power. The Feminist insists: But I have this *gnosis* in me, this consciousness, which comes from my experience, and which tells me you should ordain me. The Church says: *Ego non agnosco — Credo*. I do not know in the Gnostic manner. Rather, I believe. I believe what is revealed by the words and deeds of my Lord.

Up to now we have been talking about Faith as a virtue whereby we subject our minds and hearts to the Word of God that comes to us through the prophets of the Old Testament and through the Word of God incarnate in the New Testament. That is the subjective aspect of Faith.

PLEASE NOTE

That any book mentioned in this or other issues of *Christian Order* is obtainable from:

Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop,
4, Brownhill Road,
London SE26 2FJ: UK.

and

Carmel of Plymouth,
1, Grenville Road,
St. Jude's,
Plymouth: UK.

**CORPUS CHRISTI CHURCH,
MAIDEN LANE, STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.**

EVERY MONDAY

TRIDENTINE MASS AT 5.45 P.M.

Preceded by

ROSARY & BENEDICTION AT 5.15 P.M.

Renew : Building a People's Church

(AN AUSTRALIAN VIEW)

INTRODUCTION

RENEW is a subtle attempt to give respectability to this new "church". The Brisbane *Catholic Leader* in its issue of 21/6/87, announcing the launching of RENEW in the Cairns diocese with a report beginning : "A sense of a new Church is emerging in far north Queensland".

This new "church" is to be a people's church—a church built on people, unlike the true Church built on the Rock of Peter. The Melbourne *Advocate* of 11/6/87, reporting the launching of RENEW in the Melbourne archdiocese, quoted the statement that "RENEW is centred on people".

Prominent throughout this RENEW Mass in St. Patrick's Cathedral were performances by a group of dancing girls, in defiance of a Vatican prohibition on "liturgical" dancing at Mass and echoing the similar disobedience in the presence of the Pope himself during his 1986 visit to Australia.

Similarly, the special RENEW programme for youth advocates the use of the third rite of Penance in disobedience to the church's instructions.

Disobedience is a characteristic of the RENEW mentality, springing from its people-centred approach, implying that "we, the people, are the church", so "it is our church to change as suits us."

It is curious that, although RENEW countenances such acts of disobedience, its promoters are quick to claim that anyone who criticises or opposes it is being disobedient to their bishop.

This is a dishonest attempt to coerce loyal Catholics into accepting RENEW. Bishops have not required Catholics to take part in RENEW, and have no power to do so, although they have put strong pressure on some priests dubious of its value. Lay people have been simply invited into RENEW, and to decline an invitation is not disobedience.

Faithful Catholics are naturally reluctant to go against the wishes of their bishop (or even their parish priest). After all, the bishop shares in Christ's authority, which He gave first to Peter. And it is only in communion with the Successor of Peter that bishops can exercise their authority.

They have a duty, in union with the Pope, to teach and guard the faith of the Church "that comes to us from the Apostles".

Catholics, therefore, must respect the authority of their bishop, but they have the right, and indeed the duty, to demand that he use this authority to uphold and defend the teaching of the Church.

RENEW is certainly not doing this.

In fact, as a people-centred programme, it subverts the role of the Hierarchy, giving small lay "communities of disciples" a mandate to be a law unto themselves in the pooled ignorance of an orchestrated group.

In fact, one of the principles of RENEW, stated in the *Why, What, How?* booklet (p. 17), is the renewal of church structures at the parish and diocesan level. But these structures are determined by the Church in her Code of Canon Law, the legal basis for implementing the decisions of Vatican II in her day-to-day life.

Most people find it hard to believe that not only does the RENEW programme undermine the structure of the Church and the faith of Catholics, but that this is the very purpose for which it was designed.

Many, however, with sound Catholic instincts (the so-called *sensus fidelium*) sense there is something wrong with RENEW, despite its beguiling appearances. Something sets the alarm bells ringing.

In some areas, RENEW organisers have been hard put to get people to come to the small group home meetings. In some cases, people have deliberately avoided Masses at which RENEW is promoted, even to the extent of driving to another parish.

It has been claimed that those opposing RENEW are being divisive, but it is RENEW itself which is introducing elements at odds with the faith, and so creating divisions in homes, presbyteries and parishes.

Although part of the sales pitch of RENEW is that it is centred around the Sunday Mass, this approach enables it

to spread its infection to the greatest number of people at once—and the faithful ones at that. The RENEW materials indicate it wants Catholics to regard the Mass simply as some sort of celebration of their own faith.

In parishes with several Sunday Masses, a people-centred programme would surely provide at least one Mass free of the gimmicks and distortions of RENEW.

RENEW v THE FAITH

RENEW likens the Mass to a four-course meal with some symbolic activity. The Catholic Faith is that the Mass is the Sacrifice of the Cross, made present in all times and places by Christ our High Priest offering Himself to the Father through the person of the priests at the altar, and giving us His Body and Blood in Holy Communion.

RENEW is based on people and their personal experience, which is to be acknowledged as valid for them and revealing God to them. The Catholic faith is based on Jesus Christ and His Revelation.

RENEW emphasises sharing faith in small “communities of disciples”. The Catholic Faith speaks of the faith that comes to us from the Apostles.

RENEW asks us to reflect on Scripture and respond to it in our own way. The Catholic Faith tells us that the Teaching Church is the authoritative interpreter of Scripture. Private interpretation was the error of the Protestant Reformation, which held that Scripture alone was enough, ignoring Sacred Tradition and the Magisterium or Teaching Authority of the Church.

(In the Reformation in England, Catholics who followed their bishops found themselves out of the Church. Only one bishop, St. John Fisher, resisted the new man-made “church” and remained loyal to Rome. He died for his faith. Orthodoxy is not decided by numbers, but by truth and obedience.)

RENEW introduces atheistic secular humanism into the Church under the guise of psychology, adopting value-changing processes in its small groups. The Catholic Faith has nothing to do with manipulating people’s minds, attitudes and emotions.

RENEW presents a wrong idea of the Church—that the Church is, first of all, people, who come together to share

their faith in Jesus Christ. The Catholic Faith is that the Church is Christ, and that insofar as we are united to Him in grace through Baptism, we become members of the Church, joining the communion of the faithful which is His Mystical Body.

A video film produced to promote RENEW and shown at Mass has a speaker saying that lay people must be the Church. At a time when the Church's teaching about herself, as expressed by Vatican II, is being distorted and denied by some theologians and others, a statement such as this is not calculated to convey the true teaching.

RENEW is permeated with the idea that "We are church", an unCatholic expression, for its implication is that "we" are what constitutes or creates the Church. This simply is not true.

The Church is Christ's; it came forth from His wounded side upon the Cross and was placed in the care of His Blessed Mother (to whom RENEW gives scant mention), to be sent forth by His Spirit at Pentecost to teach.

Teaching must be the essence of any spiritual renewal, and RENEW lacks teaching.

St. Paul's warning to the Corinthians (2 Cor 11:4) could well be directed to dioceses introducing RENEW :

"Any newcomer has only to proclaim a new Jesus, different from the one that we preached, or you have only to receive a new spirit, different from the one you have already accepted, and you welcome it with open arms."

SEDUCED

A question that may fairly be asked is why, if RENEW is so flawed and misdirected, is it being thrust upon parishes?

The simple answer is that it looks good — if you don't look too hard.

Sincere bishops, priests, parents and others, concerned at the crisis of faith in the Church, have been looking for something to revitalise faith, and RENEW looks good, on the surface.

People have accepted it on the word of their priests. Priests have accepted it in trusting loyalty to their bishops, although some have recognised RENEW as an ideal tool to introduce the new "people's church" which is their goal.

Bishops have been persuaded to adopt it, usually on the advice of priests, nuns and others sent to America and indoctrinated in RENEW thinking by its originators in the Archdiocese of Newark, New Jersey, who have themselves toured Australia to sell it here.

But how could the bishops be deceived? Perhaps St. Paul gives us the answer in that same passage he wrote to the Corinthians:

"The serpent with his cunning seduced Eve, and I am afraid that in the same way your ideas may get corrupted and turned away from simple devotion to Christ." (2 Cor 11:3).

In an address on June 29, 1972, Pope Paul VI warned us that "the smoke of Satan" had entered the Church. That was 15 years ago; the errors of RENEW are not new.

It is precisely because of the "mistakes" since Vatican II, to which Pope John Paul II referred in his address to the Australian Bishops in Sydney last year, that people have been conditioned to accept RENEW.

Faith-destroying ideas and techniques have penetrated most movements and organisations within the Church, and teaching has been replaced by a constant bleating about social justice.

HIGHLY-COORDINATED ASSAULT

Now the formerly piecemeal attack on Catholic teaching is being followed by a highly-coordinated assault in RENEW—not only in the small home groups but at Sunday Mass, where adults and children alike have RENEW thrust at them not only in the liturgy itself but in "take-home materials" to continue the "process".

RENEW is also being pushed in the schools and in youth groups, some of which have already adopted it in all but name. The "RENEW and Youth" programme in Melbourne states quite blatantly: "Young people have a bit of a head start on the rest of the parish. They have grown up in a Church that they have always experienced to be on about the same aims and principles that RENEW is based on."

And so that one should escape, there are "outreach task forces" to ensnare those who do not come to Mass.

Moreover, the great mass of printed RENEW material has been well produced and is attractively presented. That makes it tempting to adopt and, of course, expensive.

RENEW has been something of a bonanza for its originators in the United States, and other countries which have wished to adapt it for themselves have had to pay for the privilege.

It is a financial windfall for Australian publishers, but a huge drain on parish and diocesan funds which comes from the pockets of the faithful.

Everything is provided in the package of "components", so parish co-ordinators do not need to think, but simply follow the printed directions. That is why even the wording of notices in parish bulletins is often identical.

TEMPTATION

Confronted with this readymade renewal, the temptation to accept it as a package can be overwhelming, especially when it is accompanied by growing assurances of how successful it will be.

Reports from the United States and New Zealand, however, indicate that the only positive achievement has been to provide an occasion for lonely people to meet some of their neighbours.

The negative achievements have been a radicalising of Catholics in their attitudes to the Church, the encouragement of a spirit of rebellion, a rejection of doctrine and moral principles and a denial of the supernatural.

TRUE RENEWAL

But his attack can be defeated by the one he fears most, Our Blessed Mother. She promised at Fatima in 1917 that her Immaculate Heart would triumph if we do what she asked — stop sinning, do penance in reparation for sin, be faithful to Mass and Confession, pray the Rosary daily, adore Our Lord in His Real Presence in our tabernacles and pray for the Holy Father and for priests. This is the true programme of spiritual renewal.

RENEW IS NOT CATHOLIC, and faithful Catholics should shun it.

Once the trend-setters have been pin-pointed, the task is to "winkle them out". This is the strategic problem that confronts the Church. But the question is, How ?, for the problem is also economic. Church resources are so limited that "winkling out" the trend-setters one by one is impossible. The only way is to select an issue where the Old Church and the New are in crucial conflict. This issue is the Mass. If the Old Mass is upheld and restored, the trend-setters will be defeated and their dreams of a "new" Church destroyed. If the New Mass persists as the rule, the trend-setters will gain the day and their dreams of a "new" Church will be recognised at the expense of the Old. The way, then to defeat the trend-setters is through the restoration of the Old Mass, at the very least, on a basis of parity of esteem with the New. It is for this restoration that we all have to work.

CURRENT COMMENT

Thoughts on the Church

5: THE MASS IS THE THING

THE EDITOR

Picking a Key Issue

AT this stage, we should not resign ourselves to failure and drift. No way. At this point, what we have to realise is that our problem is not only strategic, but economic; meaning by this that, lacking the resources to oust the behind-the-scenes (as you might call them) trend-setters one by one, we must find another way of using the resources we have to the best possible advantage for the defence of the Faith; of putting the trend-setters to rout, without picking on and putting to rout each one singly. We cannot do this because, as things are, we lack the resources to do it. We

must therefore look for another way of using the resources we have to achieve the result that would be ours had we the resources sufficient to deal with the behind-the-scenes trend-setters one by one. This is not defeatism: it is simply commonsense. What this means in practice is that we must select a key issue—recognised as such through the Catholic world by friend and foe alike—and mark it down, so to say, as our essential stamping ground. Our aim must be to work on this key issue very positively and with everything we have. In the process of so doing, we shall bring back hope to great numbers of Catholics who have lost it in the years that have gone by since the close of Vatican II. Please do not get me wrong here. I am not saying that other excellent counter-thrusts at present being made by courageous Catholics who love their Faith, should be discarded. No way. What I am saying is that, granted the importance of a fair number of these issues, the question here is one of priorities, which does not exclude the efforts of devoted Catholics who are fighting on other fronts. All I am saying is that, in my view, there is one issue that tops them all, enclosing them all within itself as it were, not only because of its supreme and overall importance in itself, but because—being such—it is of supreme relevance to the disastrous situation which perdures in the Catholic Church today. There is one key-issue which must take from us everything we can give it.

The Key Issue is the Mass

The issue is that of the restoration of the Tridentine Mass, at least on a basis of parity of esteem with that which has been substituted for it, *not* at the command of the Second Vatican Council, but in the wake of it and contrary to its command, which was that it should be preserved. Whether the architect of its destruction, the late Archbishop Annibale Bugnini, was or was not a Mason (I personally believe that he was and have stated so publicly before in the pages of *Christian Order*) is irrelevant in this context. The point is that the Old Mass—the Tridentine Mass, as we call it—has been destroyed. Its destruction was a brilliant piece of work from the point of view of Progressive neo-Modernism; from that of Catholics, a near-total disaster. What it

comes to is that something which was the very core of the Catholic Faith and, as such, *totally expressive* of Catholic belief, was replaced by something valid indeed; but in *no way totally expressive* of Catholic belief. Belief has crumbled as the unique and sublime Sacrifice of the Mass was kitted out in the name of renewal with little more than the man-centered trimmings of a memorial meal. *Orare est credere*: worship mirrors belief. When it no longer does so, it is inevitable that belief should go. This is precisely what is happening in the case of the Mass in the Catholic Church today. Those who would like proof can ask the Catholic children who come out of what is called Religious Instruction today what the Mass is? There is no need to say more here. Those who wish to know more of the sublime significance of the Tridentine Mass and the disaster of its destruction are recommended to read the two-part article by Michael Davies, Part One having appeared in the November issue of *Christian Order*; Part Two, in the December issue. Also published in the December issue, the Address given by Father Godfrey Carney at the Annual General Meeting of the Latin Mass Society last June. This is magnificent; the eloquent simplicity which marks Father Carney's Address speaks not only for himself, but for thousands of Catholics the world over who think and feel exactly as he does and, indeed, as I myself do, about the Old Mass. The Old Faith is within it, like a hand within a glove. It fits perfectly. It is all there. The revolutionaries knew and know it is all there. That is why their first thrust, brilliantly executed, was at the Old Mass. They knew that if that went, the rest would go too. Events have proved them quite correct. The Old Mass went and the rest did follow. It had to because, as I have said, though valid, the New Mass was and remains in no significant way expressive of Catholic belief. Almost inevitably, the New has degenerated into a man-made community "happening" and little else. Naturally enough, the Faith has followed suit; in this sense, that the supernatural which is its essence has been ditched over the last years in favour of secular do-gooding. The mark of to-days Catholic Church is thought of as being there. It is what you do that counts now, not what you are. This is the rot that lies all about us.

Despite this, it is right to ask, Will the Old Mass be brought back, again or will it not? The answer is that it must be, if we want the faith to endure.

Reaction of the Liturgical Establishment to John Paul's Indult of October, 1984

The reaction of the contemporary Liturgical Establishment in the Catholic Church—the “experts”, so to say—to Pope John Paul’s Indult of October, 1984, permitting the qualified restoration of the Old Mass, confirms what I have said already concerning the central importance of the Old Mass as, at one and the same time, the core and the expression of the Catholic Faith. The remark of an American priest-member of that Establishment on reading the news of Pope John Paul’s Indult is pertinent here. I quoted his reaction to the Indult of October in an article written in *Christian Order* for March, 1985. I think I had better quote the passage from the article which contains the quotation I have in mind. I do so because I believe the whole of it is relevant to what I have to say now and is of importance for that reason :

“For them (the contemporary Liturgical Establishment), it (the Indult of October, 1984) was a first nail driven into what they were forced to see now as the coffin of their hopes—of a New (man-made and man-centered) Church which would be set on the crumbling ruins of the now destabilized Old. Father John Gurrieri, Director of the Liturgical Secretariat of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the United States (a position of immense power) spoke for most of his fellow-members of the Liturgical Establishment when he told the *Washington Post*, ‘I first heard about the latest Vatican Directive when I opened the *Post* at breakfast. I nearly choked over my coffee’. He went on, ‘*By reforming the liturgy we reformed the Church*’ (Italics mine). There you have it. I would call that the give-away of the century. I know of no better corroboration of what I have had to say above of the ultimate design of the reformers. It was nothing less than the setting up of a New (man-made and man-centered) Church in place

of the Old. All this was now in grave peril, torpedoed by the Indult of last October (1984), as Father Gurrieri was intelligent enough to realise”.

This is what I wrote then and I would not retract a word of it now. For the arrogant clerical and religious revolutionaries who constitute still the top echelons of the contemporary Liturgical Establishment, the destruction of the Old Mass was essential if the Old Faith, of which it was the perfect expression, was to be effectively destroyed and then replaced with the “new”, easy-riding, man-centered and man-made church which was and still is the revolutionary dream. Hence the fury of the Liturgical Establishment when its members learnt of the publication of Pope John Paul’s Indult; the more so when they realised that the publication was effected over their heads and without consulting their world-wide representatives gathered together in Rome for a Liturgical Congress of their own design at the time of the Indult’s publication.

Blocking the Indult

We know that the Liturgical Establishment had, as it continues to have, its allies within the Vatican Curia. I refer to those who in the final stages of the Indult’s pre-publication, hedged it round with qualifications which made its application difficult precisely for those who appear as having wanted to make it so. These appear to have been the diocesan curial establishments working through the Bishops, which, I think, was the usual story. Be that as it may, the Liturgical Establishment was far quicker to block the Indult and nullify, more or less, the good it could have brought, than the many in the Church, who longed for the restoration of the Old Mass, were in promoting it through the Indult, which was published precisely to give appropriate effect, with papal approval, to their very real longing to have the Old Mass back. All one can say, then, is this that, instead of interpreting the Indult, as Canon Law would suggest, in as favourable a light as possible where the Faithful were concerned, the Bishops appear, world-wide, with a very few noble exceptions, to have done exactly the opposite, making the application of the Indult — quite unnecessarily — as difficult as possible. This was undoub-

tedly a body-blow where many of the Faithful were concerned. Better not to have had an Indult that raised hopes so high, only to see them dashed to the ground in the immediate wake of its publication. This brought despair to so many. Where the Liturgical Establishment was concerned, it brought rejoicing. They were the masters now; the Revolution was well on its way.



Do the Bishops Know?

At this stage, a point arises which has considerable relevance here and which I must, at least, outline. I wonder to what extent the Bishops — I am speaking in global terms — really know the mind of the Faithful. If they did — unless they are evil-minded men, which I do not for a moment believe—they would not have made it as difficult as they did for the Faithful to take advantage of Pope John Paul's Indult, restoring the Old Mass. Surely, if they loved their people, they would have done their utmost to implement the Indult in their regard. What they did, however — or what they were pressured to do by the trend-setters within the Liturgical Establishment—was precisely the reverse. News from just about everywhere is firm on this point. What one has to conclude, then, is that neither the Bishops nor the trend-setters amongst their advisers knew then or know now what a very large number of ordinary, decent and good Catholics throughout the world think and want and, in fact, long for. Either they genuinely do not know what these are thinking and wanting; *or*, like the proverbial "gentleman in Whitehall" they see themselves as knowing best what is good for the people and are determined that they should have it on their terms alone; *or*, which I do not believe of the Bishops anywhere, they are bent on creating a "new" Church, as I have described it above, and see, rightly enough, the destruction of the Old Mass as *the essential step* in this direction. Let me repeat here that I do not believe this latter of the Bishops; but, as should be clear from what has been said already, I do believe it as true of a fair number of priests and Religious, who have access to them as members of their diocesan curias and so on; *mini-Periti*, if you want to put it that way. It could be

that, in a good number of cases, these are pressurizing Bishops along a way they would rather not go, as I have indicated already in previous articles. The trend-setters want the destruction of the Old Church and its replacement with the New. They see the destruction of the Old Mass as essential to this design; and, of course, they are entirely correct in so seeing it. That is precisely why the restoration of the Old Mass is absolutely essential if their evil plans are to be thwarted. Whether you look at it *positively*, from the angle of those who love the Old Faith, or *negatively*, from the point of view of those who hate it, the fate of the Old Mass stands at the very core of the contemporary crisis within the Church. It must be restored if the Church is to stand. To the extent that the Old Mass is restored the "new" Church crumbles and, with it, the trend-setters whose object, as I have said so often, is to set it up in place of the Old. How, then do we go about the restoration of the Old Mass. Without detriment to the fine work being done in so many ways for the preservation of the Faith by faithful Catholics, I would suggest that the tragic situation in which the Church is now, calls for top priority to be given everywhere to a quiet, very firm and massive effort aimed over the years and without faltering at the unqualified restoration of the Old Mass, at the very least on a basis of parity of esteem with the New. How, then, do we go about this?

The Way Ahead

In England and Wales, there is the Latin Mass Society built, as you might say, round the Indult which Cardinal John Heenan secured for these countries — so presciently, as I believe, and so compassionately — a short time after the close of the Second Vatican Council. Since its foundation, the Latin Mass Society has done wonderful work, forging ahead steadily, within the terms of Cardinal Heenan's Indult, to bring the Old Mass back to the Catholics of England and Wales. I would describe its work as even-tempered, firm and always faithful, in exemplary fashion, to the Church's teaching and to the Holy Father. What is so encouraging at the moment is that new members are steadily being drawn into its ranks and that, amongst them, you will

find an increasing number of the young, who have not known the beauty of the Old Mass; never had it in their bones, so to say, but who have seen enough of the secularization of the New to send them in search of the supernatural. It is this that they want and it is this they have found in the Old Mass. Precisely because it is there, has been for so long and is doing so well, I would suggest, if I might, that those who are in agreement with this article, should not only join the Latin Mass Society without delay, but join it with the intention of promoting the Old Mass, within the terms of Cardinal Heenan's Indult, wherever and whenever it is possible to do so. I would suggest further that those who prefer not to join the Latin Mass Society or who live outside England and Wales should do their utmost to take advantage of Pope John Paul's Indult of October, 1984, providing for the qualified restoration of the Old Mass. It is important to realise that the Indult still stands, despite the fact that, where many dioceses throughout the world are concerned, it would seem to have fallen into abeyance, diocesan authority having brushed it — in some cases none too deftly — under the carpet. But the Indult *still stands*. There is no reason why, like the proverbial old soldier, it should be allowed to fade away. Why? It is *there*, given to the Church by the Holy Father for the benefit of the thousands who long for the Old Mass. It is *for their benefit*; and, therefore, its application should be interpreted as liberally as possible *in their favour*. This is not my private and personal view; not a bit of it. It is the view of Canon Law itself that the interpretation and application of the Indult should favour those for whose benefit it is intended and not vice versa, as appears to have been the case during the last four somewhat sorrowful years.

I content myself for the time being with these two suggestions, which come really to the same thing; which is that, through the existing channels open to us, we should push persistently and with polite firmness for the steady re-establishment throughout the Catholic World of the Old Mass. The way is there and we should take it. If it proves difficult, we should persist at it, never taking No for an answer. And where the Old Mass is said, each one of us, I think, should make an effort to be there, if it is at all possible to do so.

What a fine thing it would be if, every Monday when the Old Mass is said at Corpus Christi, Maiden Lane, London, that lovely church was *crowded out* with worshippers. There is no reason why it should not be. I hope so much that readers will make it so.

Restore the Old Mass: The Rest Will Come

In conclusion, I would like to assure any reader who might have been thinking otherwise, what this article has been written without the knowledge of the Secretary of the Latin Mass Society. I have not been put up to this job. It is no con-trick. The crisis we face in the Church is too great for that sort of pettiness, even supposing I was inclined to indulge in it. I am not. Neither will I ever be. I write this way because I am sure this is the essential line of action we must take in these appallingly crucial times. Come away from the periphery of the crisis that besets us. Take hold of the central issue of our day; the core of the whole thing. Restore the Old Mass. The rest will come.

(Concluded)

Should you wish to enrol in the Latin Mass Society, please direct your inquiries to:

The Office Secretary,
Latin Mass Society,
1-5 Maiden Lane,
London WC2E 7NA.

Catholic universities are allying themselves with the liberal and radical trends of modernity and claiming that this is what Christianity means. Reference is to the American scene. Application is general. Acknowledgements and thanks to the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, New York, U.S.A.

University and Church

JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.

THE contemporary American media have been filled with considerable discussion about the relation of the many presumably Catholic universities in the United States and elsewhere to the religion that founded and largely supports them. Many a Catholic university president is heard proclaiming nobly to a sympathetic reporter that if Rome tries to interfere, the school will declare itself a secular institution, or conversely, that the university is already a civil institution so that Rome has nothing to say about it. This sort of thing used to be considered a kind of statism, but today, it seems to be held with a kind of relief, a kind of freedom to do what is allowed by the State, whatever it is. One wonders about what things, if any, the university would not approve if the State demanded it.

At first sight, moreover, to many it looks as if finally the incompatibility of university and Church, a thesis so dear to the heart of philosophical modernity, is now clear because of the disciplinary action taken in the Kung and Curran cases. Academics, who teach substantially the same things as these two men, are now looking for a safe sanctuary in some university that will refuse to "bend" to Rome, as they say. There is, no doubt, a certain amount of what glee in this perhaps, since it presumably proves a long standing liberal bias that faith and knowledge are intrinsically contradictory. From this aspect, then, there is nothing new here except that it took the American Catholics so long to figure it out.

What is rather surprising about this phenomenon, however, is not that it has received such widespread public attention—much of it self-generated, I fear, to seek to prevent effective Roman action to guarantee that what the faith teaches will be present also in academia—but that the primary proponents of this intrinsic incompatibility of religion and knowledge have been found to be happily located within the religious universities themselves. There was a time when the American Association of University Professors recognized that specific teaching in religiously-founded universities was what they were about, so that “academic freedom” in the secular sense had quite a different meaning in religious institutions.

What has been painfully obvious, of course, is that acquiring attention in the national media is not at all difficult for those presumably Catholic scholars who do not agree with the official Church’s position on this or that view. Rarely, on the other hand, is there ever presented a coherent statement of the reasons why Catholic universities exist, how they understand truth and freedom, positions every bit as reasonable under any criterion of academic freedom or scholarly truth as the modern view. This latter position derives from an entirely different philosophical premise, one quite divergent from the understanding of truth and liberty as it exists in the West from classic times.

Pope and Ratzinger are insulted

John Paul II, likewise, perhaps the wisest and most learned Pope of our or any other time, is treated as a poor benighted simple soul from Eastern Europe who knows nothing about the niceties of freedom. This view of the Holy Father is simply laughable in objective terms, but widespread in media and academic circles. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, who has no theological peer in any American university faculty, is not much invited to present the Church’s views on education or on faith within academia itself because he might just have something valid to say.

Joseph Sobran recently observed that it was quite remarkable that the *Washington Post*, for instance, has devoted an enormous amount of attention to this question of religious freedom over the years, but that hardly once has it ever presented an objective, clear statement of what the Church

does or does not hold on any given topic. When the Catholic religion is in fact discussed, the presenters are invariably dissenters from the central position of the Church. Freedom of expression means presenting the dissenters, not presenting any sensible, sane statement of what the Church itself holds. Freedom of the press does not mean clear, objective statement of what the Catholic Church does hold, and why.

In one sense, it is rather easy to sympathize with the Holy See in this context. Catholicism has historically not been in the least afraid of philosophic discourse, nor of the variety of opinion that in fact exists among mankind in the pursuit of explaining about reality. Indeed, I suspect, one of the root causes of the current disaffection between nominally Catholic universities and the organs of the Holy See is rooted in the narrowness of the universities, not the Holy See. "Knowledge" of all divergent opinions is, as any one who recalls the very structure of Aquinas' *Summa* will remember, simply a condition of any truth.

The essential difference, I think, lies in the very notion of modernity upon which the practice of the contemporary university is based and which the dissenting Catholic university feels it must imitate to have civil and intellectual credibility. As a result, the enormous case for specifically Christian intelligibility goes by default and is rarely heard in those institutions which were specifically set up to foster and publicize it.

In the marvellous *Conversations with Eric Voegelin*, on this point, we read :

One must not be too optimistic with regard to the *power* of ideologies. Once ideologies are institutionally established—the Communist Government in Russia or in China or in the satellite states, or in our society (established in academic institutions) certain intellectual ideologies which do not immediately become political (like positivism of the various kinds, or various kinds of Freudianism)—they last a long time, because there is a vested interest in them. *Every new generation is brought into them through college education — and it takes a while until they snap out of it. The college teaching level is usually thirty, fifty, or more years back of what is going on*¹.

In this context, the origin of objections to a Christian presence in Catholic universities arises not from Christianity itself but from the adherence within academia to outmoded ideas based in modern ideologies. What is different today is that now a sufficiently large number of administrators and faculty in Catholic universities live by and teach what is in effect a modern ideology that no room is recognized for a full and authentic place for Christianity.

Cropsey indicts our seminaries

Undoubtedly, the key to understand what has been going on beneath the surface of this issue is contained in something Professor Joseph Cropsey wrote several years ago concerning the sort of education that was in fact taking place within Christian seminaries. Cropsey wrote perceptively :

No one who is aware of the tendencies stirring in schools of divinity can doubt that actual Christianity is not free of every trace of influence coming from natural science, socialism, existentialism, and psychoanalysis. Furthermore, it is not in their pure forms but rather as they have sunk down into common understanding that science, socialism, existentialism, and psychoanalysis have come to bear not only on Christianity but, through Christianity or directly in their own names, on life itself.²

The point Cropsey was making is of the greatest importance in a world in which, on religious campuses, "social justice" or "consciousness raising" often means advocating the "Christian" nature of the new tyranny in Nicaragua, while concern for the poor means turning more programs over to the governmental bureaucracies, disguised in various noble sounding movements.

Catholic universities, far from presenting a different or uniquely religious point of view within the common good and in behalf of it, are in fact merely allying themselves with the liberal and radical trends of modernity and claiming that this is what Christianity means. It is the criticism of this reality that the Church is rightly carrying on that is being objected to. Cropsey and other outside observers are rather close to the heart of the problem. In the 1981 re-edition of Czeslaw Milosz' powerful *The Captive Mind*, he writes,

[The] subject [of this book] is the vulnerability of the twentieth-century mind to education by sociopolitical doctrines and its readiness to accept totalitarian terror for the sake of a hypothetical future. . . . Perhaps in my part of Europe several of my analyses are regarded as self-evident, but the power of attraction exerted by totalitarian thinking, whether of the left or of the right, does not belong to the past; on the contrary, it seems to be on the increase.³

This is written, prophetically perhaps, from Berkeley, California.

The major difference between the religious mind during the time, say, of Pius XI and our own era, is, I think, that it was then able to understand the basic truth of such an observation. Fifty years later, it seems, that it is almost necessary for religion to live under a totalitarian system to understand what the real premises of absolutist systems are, and even then, the number of apologists for the system is large. The religious university has not shown itself immune from this influence in any notable fashion.

Universities deceive

During the course of this recent controversy, several writers have made the point about "truth in advertizing". That is, why should any university claiming to be in fact Catholic, and therefore announcing to parents, faculty, students, and the world where it stands, teach as Catholic things which are not so on any objective grounds? This is the most cogent of questions, no doubt, never really answered. This is not, it is important to notice, the same as saying that the positions of dissenters should now be known and explicated. There would be nothing wrong, I think, with a course entitled, say, "Contemporary Catholic Dissenters". What is objectionable, even unethical as such, is to have these same dissenters teach what is dissent as Catholic. This is more than merely "unauthentic". It is dishonest and deceiving.

I have often wondered whether those state and secular universities which have religious studies programs do not in fact teach, when they give a course called "Catholicism", more accurately what the Church says it holds of itself than the theology courses at a local Catholic university. This is

not really an argument for "censorship", though it is my opinion that censorship is very prevalent in Catholic universities today, the censorship of orthodoxy. How many Catholic universities, I often muse, have a course in the Thought of John Paul II so that the students could really know what this brilliant, charismatic man has been teaching and doing ? It is no accident that there are few, if any.

Should we even bother anymore ?

The question can be asked, of course, whether we should even bother with Catholic universities any more. Everyone grants in theory, no doubt, that they are generally a good idea, but not at any cost. It is quite clear to the average non-Catholic that there is some basic difference between what goes on in Catholic universities and what the Church teaches about itself. This leaves the impression that there is some sort of division between faith and reason. However, if the argument elaborated earlier is correct, the issue is not between faith and reason in the classical sense, a position which is no longer even heard in the universities, but between ideology and truth. The question that comes up is rather whether truth must not be sought henceforth outside the religious university.

Eric Voegelin, with some acerbity, wrote :

I knew ten years ago that our universities, not only in America but in Europe, were completely rotten : brothels of opinion, no science, nothing. But I could not have predicted that five years later, in 1965, we should have an outbreak which recognizes that the universities are dead. I cannot predict today what within ten years new forms of institutions will have arisen in the Western world in which science will again be possible. . . I would very well imagine our getting new organizational forms, outside the organization of the universities, in which science is conducted. . .⁴

More than ten years have passed. The universities in some sense, to be sure, seem to be prospering. Yet there are newer smaller institutions, organizations, in which study of *what is* can happen in a way it cannot happen in the universities, especially Catholic universities.

Stanley Jaki, in his penetrating essay "The University and the Universe", wrote: "The university must give the universe so that the world may have religion, or else the world will have a counter-religion, a much worse predicament than all the disasters which true religion may, in spite of itself, promote".⁵ Jaki makes the point that Voegelin did; that the true relation between the origins and nature of science is now more and more known but it is not the one that is primarily known or taught in the university. The famous remark of Mother Teresa about the spiritual poverty of the well-off being a greater problem than the poverty of the actual poor is to the point here.

The tragedy of Catholic universities is not that the Holy See is trying to urge that the intellectual riches of Christian philosophy be present within them, but that the substitute Christianity that is in fact encountered in the universities leaves generations of students still unsatisfied and no longer able to find in Catholicism much sustenance, since what they received was admittedly hostile to what the Church said about itself. We have the irony of intellectual Catholic students and adults looking for Catholicism and no longer knowing what they are looking for since they think they already know what it teaches about itself.

Chesterton, I think, had it pretty much right at the end of *Heretics*:

Truths turn into dogmas the instant that they are disputed. Thus every man who utters a doubt defines a religion. And the skepticism of our time does not really destroy the beliefs, rather it creates the. . . We who are Christians never knew the great philosophic common sense which inheres in that mystery until the anti-Christian writers pointed it out to us. The great march of mental destruction will go on. Everything will be denied. Everything will become a creed. . . We shall be left defending, not only the incredible virtues and sanities of human life, but something more incredible still, this huge impossible universe which stares us in the face. We shall fight for visible prodigies as if they were invisible. We shall look on the impossible grass and the skies with a strange courage. We shall be of those who have seen and yet have believed.⁶

This powerful passage, it seems to me, stands at the heart of what is now going on. It is not our universities that are defending the visible prodigies. The "strange courage" paradoxically is found in the Holy Father. He has seen and believed.

We might, more justly, it seems, say the match is unfair. After all, in this battle, how many intellectual divisions does the Pope really have, to recall a famous remark of Mr. Stalin? The answer is, of course, that he has very few. Most of those who historically have vowed to come to his aid are silent or in the media against him. The idea that somehow the balance of power and public opinion is on the side of Rome is simply false. More and more, the Church must do all the acting. The loss of morale and loyalty is quite visible, especially in those areas where support is historically and even by vow most expected.

The opposition to the truths of the faith from within the Catholic universities has pointed out the truths of the faith again to us. The opponents have now stated what they hold. Even reporters can see it is not the same as the traditional positions. These controversies have reminded us that there is a distinction between what the Church teaches and what is being taught. We have not sufficiently realized this.

"Our listless universities"

But the transcendent truths well up from within and from outside the light and glare of publicity. We do need institution in which *what is* is respected, in which the faith that is addressed to reason meets a reason that is free from ideology. We need to be sure that the Christianity or Catholicism we profess is not subtly transformed so that its words remain the same but its meanings have become totally conformed to one or other modern ideology.

In a famous essay, Allan Bloom referred to "our listless universities". This is a penetrating phrase. In it we catch a sense of a complete lack of that to which Augustine could answer, "Late, late have I loved Thee". That is, in this controversy about the Catholic universities, we cannot help but notice the enormous enthusiasm and indeed passion for truth and being that John Paul II causes wherever he

goes, especially among university students. There is something almost perverse about making a reputation in opposing this good man. Perhaps it would be different if John Paul II had not written or spoken so powerfully about truth, had not searched for it, lived for it in a way few professors ever have.

From a classical Catholic point of view, what is most disheartening is not so much opposition, but the contrast between the romance of our being, manifested in the Church and its truths as taught by John Paul II, and the dull conformity to academic ideology within the universities. Outsiders like Voegelin and Cropsey could see it for what it is, an utterly self enclosed world not even knowing its own narrowness, a listlessness that has no other defense but its inability to be drawn by the eros of transcendence. There is a place for intelligence in the universities, but if it be not allowed there, the intelligence also actively spoken to by faith, then intelligence will have to be sought elsewhere.

The crisis of the American Church today is that it does not as yet have other institutions on a sufficiently large scale in which this attraction to the transcendent can happen. Yet, it does not take much. It is strange but the great monastic movements of the past, the great initiatives of the spirit began, like the Incarnation itself, in small and tiny places, in opposition, in the refusal of the mighty secular and secularized institutions to listen to the call of truth.

Leo Strauss teaches

Not a few are beginning to think that at least a few small places have begun to appear. The parable of the mustard seed, I suspect, remains the ultimate response of the Church to those of its institutions that do not remain in the original shoot. They will die and be cut off. The tiny plants will be found to have been growing all along; we just did not notice them. In a famous passage in his essay "What is Liberal Education?" Professor Leo Strauss wrote: "Ultimately there must be teachers who are not in turn pupils. The teachers who are not in turn pupils are the . . . greatest minds. Such men are extremely rare. We are not likely to

meet any of them in any classroom".⁷ As Solzhenitsyn remarked to the students of Harvard in 1978, even in universities which have "truth" as their mottos, the condition of truth may be quite problematic.⁸

The truths of Christianity will go on whether the university be within its ambitus or not. To discover the greatest minds, to be among those who have seen and yet believed, we need to recognize that the adventure of intelligence includes an openness to the truth that the Rock that is Peter stands for. Today, as never before, we can see that Peter stands for something, something quite distinct. Everything has become a creed, as Chesterton foresaw, including what is proclaimed by those who refuse the Creed associated with Peter.

Peter is the Rock

The question is not, in conclusion, whether we will study a creed, but which creed. This is what the controversy between the university and the Church is about. The main difference between the Church and the university is that it is the Church which holds that not all creeds are the same. It is for this truth that it saw that it was necessary to build universities in the first place. There is no reason, in this sense, that she will not have to do so again.

NOTES

1. *Conversations with Eric Vogelin*, Edited by R. Eric O'Connor (Montreal: Thomas More Institute, 1980), 16-17. Italics added.
2. Joseph Cropsey, "America as a Regime", in *Political Philosophy and the Issues of Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), 6.
3. Czeslaw Milosz, *The Captive Mind* (New York: Vintage, 1981), v.
4. *Ibid.*, 110.
5. Stanley Jaki, "The University and the Universe", *Chance or Reality and Other Essays* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1986), 196.
6. G. K. Chesterton, *Heretics* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1905, 1986), 206-207.
7. Leo Strauss, "What Is Liberal Education?" *Liberalism: Ancient and Modern* (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 3.
8. *Solzhenitsyn at Havard* (Washington: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1980), 3.

The life and death of St. John Fisher holds lessons for us all, especially today; as Father Placid Croney shows so well in this powerful and, in many ways, intensely moving article.

Lonely Shepherd

PLACID CRONEY, O.P.

Babyhood Hero

IN my youth I was much drawn to the reading of the martyrs. Amongst the martyrs, the saint who made the strongest appeal to me was St. John Fisher. Had the question been asked me when I was a lad at school, who was my hero, I can only think my answer would have been, St. John Fisher. Other great characters of history I admired, but Fisher I loved. I treasured his very utterance. Many of his sayings went deep into my soul. Here is a quotation :

"Truly it was a more glorious sight to see St. Paul, who got his living by his own great labour in hunger, thirst, watchings, in cold, going wool-clad and bearing about the Gospel and law of Christ both upon the land and on the sea, than to behold now the Archbishops and Bishops in their apparel, be it never so rich. In that time were no chalices of gold but there were many golden priests. Now be many chalices of gold and almost no golden priests".

"Truly neither gold, precious stones nor golden bodily garments be not the cause wherefore kings and princes of the world should dread God and His Church, for doubtless they have far more wordly riches than we have. But holy doctrine, good life and example of honest conversation be the occasion whereby good and holy men (also wicked and cruel people) are moved to love and fear Almighty God".

I recall the sadness that came over me when I first encountered the words: "In that time . . . *Now be many chalices of gold and almost no golden priests*". But, thank God, I have known many "golden priests".

Pen—Portrait

We have a pen-portrait of the Saint left by his anonymous biographer. "In stature of body he was tall and comely,

exceeding the common and middle sort of men; for he was the quantity of six foot in height. And being therewith very slender and lean, was nevertheless upright and well framed, straight-backed, big jointed and strongly sinewed. His hair was black by nature . . . his eyes large and round, neither full black nor full grey, but of a mixed colour between both, his forehead smooth and large . . . somewhat wide-mouthed and big-jawed as one ordained to utter speech, much wherein was, notwithstanding a certain loneliness . . . Vainly or without cause he would never speak. Neither was his ordinary talk of common wordly matters, but rather of the divinity and high power of God — of the joys of heaven and the pains of hell — of the glorious death of martyrs and straight life of confessors . . . In study he was very laborious and painful, in preaching assiduous, ever beating down heresy and vice, in prayer most fervent and devout, in fasting, abstinence and punishing of his bare body, rigorous without measure”.

Except for the description of his physical and outward bearing, the rest could well be a description of St. Dominic. St. Dominic had no small talk. It is said of him that he spoke only of God or the things of God. A lesson for most of us here. To watch our words and be somewhat sparing of speech. But don't be misled. Neither of these saints was dull or solemn or without humour. They rejoiced in the Lord, and spoke out of the abundance of a heart that loved God.

Saint for Our Day

St. John Fisher is surely the saint for our day. True ecumenism necessitates a defence of our faith. The “forward movement” will be of little avail unless the defences are solid and strong. The Church is being attacked today, in a more subtle way than ever before in all her long history. Very strongly attacked and certainly in a manner more subtle than we have experienced hitherto. Attacked from within the camp. The enemy within the gates are the spies, propagandists, defeatists who masquerade as our friends. These are our lusts and our soft pleasures. We have those with us who publicly defend impurity, immorality, abortion and all manner of beastly practices. Who don't merely

disobey Authority but, infinitely more to be deplored, condemn the authority. No one can deny this affirmation. Such things are manifest to all who have seeing eyes. "None so blind as those who won't see"—St. John. I make this enemy within the camp, Enemy Number One. Lust, sinful relaxations, soft pleasures, these throw dust in our eyes, they blind us, darken us, darken the mind in some way — no need to specify, there have been not a few instances in very recent days — so that the mind is of no use to us. We see double. We no longer know what's what, like a man intoxicated. It makes us that we don't know who is the enemy. We can't shoot straight because we can't see straight. So, tighten your belt, live clean and hard so that you can see straight.

St. John Fisher saw straight. So straight that he saw events twelve years before they happened. So long before his martyrdom was he preparing, by prayer and fasting, for grace and fortitude to offer his life for the Faith. Another lesson for us today. Who knows what the future holds for us. We are not pessimists. The true Catholic can never be a pessimist. We know with divine certainty that God's Church will live all our days and go on to the end of time. Yes, but, we also know that were there only two Catholics in all the world, there is the Church. There are other internal enemies besides those I have mentioned which I would place as Internal Enemy No. 2. I do not wish to pursue that now nor mention the varied levels of our external enemies.

Alone Among the Shepherds

St. John Fisher was wide awake. That is the point I wish to stress. In this, as far as we can see, he was *alone* among the shepherds of the Catholic flock of his day. History like Scripture is for our learning. It is a very sad reflection. The thought saddened me when I was a boy at school. It still saddens me.

There was one other bishop who held out and refused to take the oath, a Dominican who was chaplain to Queen Catherine. But among his own body of bishops, the bishops of the Church in this country, St. John Fisher was

utterly alone. That fact speaks volumes. He was ready to die because he never allowed himself to forget what was the *primary purpose of a bishop*. The bishop is a seer or overseer. *His primary duty is to watch*. Watching is primary for every individual. Our Lord tells us to "watch and pray". It would seem that watching is more important than prayer. It is all the more the duty of the bishop, because watching is the *raison d'être* of his state. Was there ever a time in all the long history of the Church when "watching" was more necessary than it is to day?

Watch and Pray

Our saint had possibly underlined the text: "My eyes are always on the Lord, and He will keep my feet from the snare". He was too alert to be trapped. It was because "he kept his eyes on the Lord" he saw clearly. Nothing distracted him. He didn't see double. He was disciplined in mind and body. He was fortified against Enemy No. 1 within the camp. We "need today to fortify the *mind* against evil, for the *mind* is the inner citadel of the soul, which if the enemy is allowed to enter, the whole castle may fall". "Watch and pray" Our Lord warns us. Be on the alert, don't allow the enemy to throw dust in your eyes, to darken your mind. Christ is our Light. "In Thy light we shall see light".

This is the lesson I learn from my saint hero of my school days. Pillars have fallen. There's not much joy in the thought. One can always learn by the mistakes of others, as well as by our own. They fell because they were not watching. God knows each of us is fully conscious of his own weakness. Always when we have fallen there has been a neglect in watching. Our Blessed Lord was most insistent. St. Peter didn't seem to have grasped the meaning of it. His Master had told him to "watch and pray". He didn't watch. He slept. St. Peter didn't look ahead. That is why he fell and denied his Lord.

The lesson above all others that St. John Fisher teaches us is the necessity of being on the alert, awake, so that we shall not be taken by surprise. To refuse to be drugged! At this juncture I have received a letter. In it I read: "Our little Anna has made her first confession and is due to re-

ceive her first Holy Communion on 13th June. Please remember her on that day, Father. She is going to have a difficult time ahead of her if she is to live her spiritual life properly in the years to come". "In the years to come"—Those words have touched me deeply. My heart goes out to the sweet child. God will have her in His keeping because it is evident that her parents know what is meant by "watching". We must needs "see, foresee and forestall". These were the words impressed upon me by my old Master of Theology on a long walk we took together out of town. A walk never to be forgotten, because of the words of wisdom I was privileged to hear. He made quite clear what he meant by "forestalling" by evidencing the Reformation. I remember his saying "*There's no use in getting in after the devil*". "A man is just as dead who slips over a precipice as a man who throws himself over". I got a very clear idea that day of what is meant by "watching". "Among the bishops" he said "only one was watching — Bishop John Fisher. He wasn't taken by surprise. He was ready when the time of trial came". Because he watched his spiritual life was always deepening. What a genius some people have for making things grow because they watch. The person who watches puts first things first.

Bishop Fisher Living by the Spirit

Another lesson from the saint. He lived by the Spirit. That is his word to us. To live by *his* life, the life of grace, the *supernatural* life. When did you last hear this word? "You wouldn't expect to see it in the world's Press. Do you see it even in the Catholic Press?" "Progress" is the written and the spoken word of our days. Everything is judged by "progress". Everything, our way of life, our pursuits, our pleasures, our hobbies, even our clothes. One must "be with it". Otherwise you are a fossil. You are dead. So presumably "to be with it" means to live. And so we Catholics must "live" like everybody else. Even our nuns must perforce change their distinctive religious dress (habits) into frocks. They must "live" like everybody else. It is easy to prophesy what will come of this! Their end is not far off.

One couldn't but observe in Bishop Fisher a degree above the ordinary for reverence, decorum, respect. He revered the poor. He treated everybody with due reverence. To see him offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, was an experience not to be forgotten. One was filled with awe, a deep sense of the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. To prepare himself for his day of martyrdom, he celebrated Holy Mass with a skull on the altar. It would seem that the sense of reverence and honour due to people has departed these days, with so many other beautiful things. Last week a Catholic mother, in evident distress, told me of a young woman who approached her to say that she had just been to Confession to Percy! At the risk of being thought antiquated and fossilized, I must own that I too was shocked and horrified. *Where is the reverence? Where the honours to the Priesthood?* Is it not plain to be seen why vocations to the priesthood have dwindled and are dwindling? The priests who give out "Call me Geoffrey, call me Dick", are doing an incalculable amount of harm to the priesthood. *I know this to be true.* Convents have almost dried up of vocations, the priesthood suffers likewise and all because of the Sisters and the Priests themselves. All this is part of what we mean by "watching".

The Church of the Country

At least once a month I venture out on a long country walk. It is sheer delight to strike a pathway through the meadows, and to go on tramping "over the hills and far away", the heart bursting with joy at seeing the sights and hearing the sounds, that God in His goodness so lavishly provides for one's pleasure. Here is an opportunity for watching the real thing. There is a great conspiracy in these days, so many things are attracting out attention that it is quite possible we have eyes and see not. We are not watching, not seeing the right things. We have to watch the concrete circumstances in which we live.

There is a wonderful charm in going into the country with persons who understand natural science. You realise they are all the time watching. They know what they want to see. They see it—perhaps a certain bird, "Oh yes, there it is"! The intelligent eye is upon the *external circum-*

stances. That is a very important thing. Our Lord said "You can tell what the weather is going to be, but you cannot discern the signs of the times in your own soul". We are not watching principles—not knowing what to look for. We must watch by having definite principles. Certain and sure principles to fall back upon. The example my old master gave me was "etiquette", meaning Christian etiquette which is the slow growth of centuries, dealing chiefly with the relations between the sexes, the various kinds of authority, parental, ecclesiastical, the authority of age, etc. Much of this in our day has gone by the board. Catholic etiquette, which is practically identical in all countries, is founded on Catholic Principles. I remember his saying to me, "beware of any changes in that universally accepted etiquette". Obviously the old accepted standards have, to say the least, been a great deal modified of late. This surely is a change for the worse. *Principles never change.* Any change based on the denial of old principles must be severely challenged. We might find we are ceasing to watch. Laws when right are the best guides. Law is the concentrated wisdom of the wise. With the change in "etiquette", chasity hardly counts now. With the old-fashioned views of authority, States would be much more stable. Marriage in these days is becoming nothing more than a limited-liability company.

Watch Always and Warily

God alone knows what is coming. We must be watching all the time, and watching warily. The lonely shepherd is a model for us all. He was loyal to the Church and to its great principles. Once he was convinced of the right course of action, nothing would deter him. Nothing would bend his purpose. Not even death. Here is the *official watchman, the seer*, who not only saw but foresaw and forestalled. We all know the principles by which we should be guided. The principles which the Church gives us are the ten commandments and the commandments of the Church. These are the great principles we ought to live. By falling back on these we are watching. That is the wisdom of God.

To the great numbers of Catholic mothers, whom we have every reason to believe, are anxious and fearful for the

spiritual well-being of their children, we can only advise them to do all in their power to train their children in Catholic ways, whilst their children are in their care. Example is by far the best teacher. They cannot do more than that. They may not do less. Having done all, then they can leave them to God. If the children have been taught to pray, to make use of the sacraments of Confession and Holy Communion regularly, e.g., fortnightly; then the parents have no cause to be worried. But parents themselves must set the example. By doing this they prepare the children to face the trials which inevitably await them as soon as they have passed out of parental control and go out into the world. We must face facts. We must not tell ourselves that all will be well. All won't be well. One needn't be a prophet to foretell that.

Identity with the Wisdom of Christ

We must be practical and realistic in the most important matters of our soul. What shall we do to watch in the immediate years that lie ahead? The Arch Enemy is against us. He can and does lay plans so deep as to deceive even the elect—so deep as to suggest the very wisdom of God. Can *anyone* tell what is coming? More than ever before we have these days to be on our guard. But how more true in the things of religion. Never have there been so many dangers to our religious life than there are at the present day. It is a dangerous age for those who are trying to live for God, to be loyal to Catholic Principles. There are dangers at home, at school, at play, at work. There are snares everywhere for the unwary. We must remember that nearly all the sin of the world is due to a failure to watch. So watch, learn from the dangers of the past. Avoid the known dangers. *We are bound to do that.* A captain of a ship wouldn't, just for the fun of it, steer his ship into the ice-bergs. "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of the light". Our wisdom is no match for the devil's. We must watch with the wisdom of God. How wise is the Church? How wise in her Sacraments of Marriage, Holy Eucharist, Baptism?

Following St. John Fisher, we must identify ourselves with the wisdom of Christ. "Let this mind be in you which is the mind of Christ". I owe Him my mind. We forget

this. If we put God first—we are all bound to do that—we need worry about nothing else. All things will fall into their proper places. We cannot do this without a struggle. We must realise that our Catholic life is a warfare. The evil of our day is an irreligious evil, the decline in faith and morals. St. Paul tells us: "Take unto you the armour of God, that you may be able to resist in the evil day and to stand in all things perfect. Stand therefore having your loins girt about with truth and having on the breastplate of justice. And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace: In all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith you may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one. And take unto you the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit (which is the word of God)". Ephes. 6.11-17.

We Lack the Courage to Speak Out

How perfectly applicable is St. Paul's message to St. John Fisher. A small commentary on his life. The only weapon of attack that we have is the "Sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God". The sword of the Spirit refers to the spoken word of the gospel—to that word which the Centurion spoke to Christ ("say but the word" etc.), the word of *a visible Church of command*: of a General commanding the Colonels, the Colonels the Majors and so on down the ranks. The Gospel is the only strength given to us, the only weapon we have. Our Lord never worked with anything except words. Our fault is that we are too silent, too quiet, too exclusive. We haven't the courage to speak out. We don't make the word sufficiently heard at our work, in the streets, in the press. We are cowards. We have long since ceased to profess our Faith in public. We have come to think that we must hide it, except in Church and in the house. Even in these days of Ecumenism, we almost apologise for being Catholics. We are afraid of being dubbed "triumphalist". We excuse ourselves by saying "Well you know, it isn't our temperament, it isn't English"! Old Satan loves to hear that, and counts it one for him! We say we are shy and won't admit the truth and own up to the plain fact, that we are afraid to own God in public. I have often heard people say "Bless you" but very seldom "God bless you". Is that a small thing? I don't think so.

I have yet to see people sign themselves with the Cross and say Grace at meals in a restaurant. We make excuses. How many of us Catholics pass by the Church door, without a thought to enter to adore our God. We believe, don't we, that *HE* is there in the tabernacle. We are called upon to assert ourselves, not for ourselves but for God and His Church, not aggressively—not for a moment do I suggest that—but calmly and without fear or shame; as men who consciously possess the truth, who out of love for their fellow-men, wish to bring them also to the knowledge of the truth. That is practical Charity. That is our vocation as Catholics, *to spread the GOOD NEWS*. But you won't do that unless you know it, and you won't know it unless you listen to it, pray about it, live it and love it.

Stand Fast: Fear Only to Offend God

Let me, before concluding, put down what I have just now come upon in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians 4:8-9. So well do the verses apply to our illustrious saint and bishop and cardinal: "All that rings true, all that commands reverence, and all that makes for right: all that is pure, all that is lovely, all that is gracious in the telling; virtue and merit, wherever virtue and merit are found—let this be the argument of your thoughts. The lessons I taught you, the traditions I handed on to you, all you have heard and seen of my way of living—let this be your rule of conduct. Then the God of peace will be with you". (Knox) In the same Chapter: "Therefore my brethren . . . *stand fast* . . . beloved". That is all of us. *No compromise*, but straightforward and strong. I am minded of a lighthouse, the winds howling around it, the waves pounding against it. I remember Mr. Standfast. What a marvellous name to deserve. Cardinals Mindszenty and Beran of our time. We need to stand fast. Remember our fight is not against flesh and blood, but against Principalities and Power. Don't blame those who may be attacking the Church in these days, whoever they may be Communists, Anarchists, Freemasons. Don't blame them. They have been redeemed with the Blood of Christ, they are potential members of the Mystical Body of Christ. We have nothing to fear from any earthly enemy. The most they can do is to

kill us ! "Fear only Him who can cast your body *and soul* into hell". Fear God only. Fear to offend Him. If you fear to offend Him the chances are that you won't offend Him. Holy Fear is the first effect of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the soul.

John Fisher had one only fear. He was fearful of betraying his Master. So must it be with all of us. Have we the guts, the stamina to stand up and stand fast for the rights of Christ and His Church ? Fear is widespread today. You see it in people's faces. People are fearful for what the future holds. All this in spite of the modern slogan of "progress". They have a very big fear of death. They are afraid in the wrong way, not afraid in the Catholic way, not John Fisher's fear. Like John Fisher we need not fear Poverty. He had the poorest diocese in England. He wanted the poorest diocese and refused preferment. When the King's men raided his house, hoping to find we know not what, they were disappointed and angry because all they found were a few rickety chairs, an old bedstead scantily covered, and lastly to their deepest disgust and embarrassment, after forcibly opening a locked chest, a few hair shirts and implements of penance ! The scene is not altogether without humour. The only things he could boast of among his possessions were his books. The workman must have his tools.

Suffering ? God won't try us beyond our strength. Fear not calumnies, attacks, ignominy, sarcasm, injustice. These need not break us. Neither pain of body nor of soul. Not even death. Fear only *sin*—St. Paul longed to be dissolved and to be with Christ—which separates us from Christ. Remember the Church is set in an irreligious world. Our aim should be to live with Christ, in Christ, and to be Christ-like.

Strength in Loneliness

I headed this paper "the lonely shepherd". How lonely indeed must he have been. Imagine him in the Bell Tower, alone not merely in body but in mind. His isolation was complete. More lonely I think than his fellow layman martyr Thomas More. Here is a bishop cut off from his fellow-bishops. Cromwell underestimated his strength of

will, thinking that a taste of the Tower—and a sight of the axe! — might cow him into submission. It was in his loneliness that he found *strength*. Sycophants of the King were sent to try to dissuade him and to deflect him from his determined purpose. Their visits were time wasted. "They went even as they came". Then the king sent visitors who were brother bishops. This must have been acute suffering. The evidence is that there were more than three bishops, but only three names are given. The three mentioned are : Bishop Stokesley of London, Bishop Gardiner of Winchester, Bishop Tunstall of Durham. Be it known for our comfort, that subsequently the three made known their bitter repentance. "Had Fisher been willing" as More wittily said, "to pin his faith on any man's back, no men in England would have equalled these three in their hopes of changing Fisher's faith" (quoted by Fr. V. McNabb in his *St. John Fisher*).

Move on to the end. He was so weak that he had to be carried to the gate of the Tower, to be handed over to the Sheriff of London for beheading. Whilst waiting for this formality to take place, he rose from the carrying-chair and leaned against the wall. He opened his book of the New Testament and asked God for some word to give him strength. He opened the book at the Gospel of St. John, his eyes falling on the words that Our Divine Lord spoke to His Father in the supper room. "This is eternal life to know Thee, the only true God and Him Whom Thou has sent, Jesus Christ. I have glorified Thee on earth. I have finished the work Thou gavest me to do. And now glorify Thou me, Father, with Thyself, with the glory which I had" etc. Then he shut the book, saying, "Here is learning enough for me even to my life's end".

On the scaffold he spoke but a few words, telling all who had foregathered there, that he was about to die for the faith, and begged their prayers even in that extremity, that he might be steadfast to the end.

St. John, do you pray for all of us that we may be steadfast to the end.

Though written independently of it, this article can be taken as a follow-up to Peter Wilders' perceptive piece, "Evolutionists at Bay", published in the August/September issue of *Christian Order*. The use of somewhat technical language is more or less unavoidable in any discussion of Evolution. Despite this necessary handicap, the reader will find the thrust of this article very clear. For this, the Author deserves our thanks.

More on Evolution

SYLVESTER MARSHALL

FUTURE generations will be puzzled that such a flawed theory as evolution was allowed to persist as a scientific model for any length of time. In effect, it exposes the strength of purpose and the influence of its secular proponents in today's society, that the myth appears in the syllabuses of every examination board, and as compulsory teaching in the Biology classroom.

The "Big Bang"

The theory of evolution claims that all living matter emerged from the chance sparking-together of two gases, hydrogen + nitrogen in the presence of water, to make Ammonia and amino acids. Lightning, striking the primordial protein soup on the rock surface of planet Earth, by some means unknown to science catalysed the lifeless sludge into a living mass of jelly; which then slowly evolved by chance and through natural selection to develop over aeons of time into the complex diversity of animal and plant species we know today. The apparent similarity of the structure found in the limbs and joints of human and fish foetuses for example, was thought to add great weight to this Darwinian theory of evolution from common ancestry, with ensuing parallel ascents which developed into fish, reptile, bird and animal forms, and then finally from ape to man.

Enormous Odds Against

Even proponents of evolution were obliged to admit that the odds against these occurrences were enormous; so they attempted to substantiate their theories of Natural Selection by reference to a process of continuous and unbroken change, over the almost immeasurable period of 4,600 million years which they claimed had elapsed since the 'Big Bang' was supposed to have brought the universe into being. Such an immense time lapse, they said, can make the improbable become very likely. In 1954, Julian Huxley, atheist and prominent evolutionist, admitted, "The production of a fruit fly has a probability so minimal that the odds against it would need to be expressed by a number containing as many noughts as there are letters in the average novel". He went on to say, "this number would be greater than that of all the electrons and protons in the visible universe". In his book, *Evolution as a Process*, he tried to justify the process with the remark "The strength of natural selection may be measured by the difficulty it overcomes, the odds against which it is pitted. For it is natural selection which transforms impossibility into fact. Only natural selection, by insuring the survival of those rare mutations, can bring into being the most improbable adaptations". Dr. Himmelfarb adds the tagline, "as improbable as a monkey plus typewriter brought together would, by chance, print out the works of Shakespeare".

No Truly Intermediate Fossils

Scientists hold that the stratigraphic succession of sedimentary deposits is precisely defined within a geological time scale; each sedimentary era running into millions of years and represented by specific beds of rock, with the older beds underneath and the newer beds lying on top (called the Law of Superposition). By 1980 it was widely accepted that abundant transition fossils should have been found, if man and animals had indeed evolved slowly through natural selection, as suggested by Darwin. Each of the thousands of transitional forms through the many intermediate stages would have been present in vast numbers, and would have been found within each stratum of the suc-

cession of rocks. In fact, only specific and not transition fossil remains are evident within the total succession of strata, from pre-Cambrian to Tertiary eras. There are no intermediate fossils and there is no verifiable evidence of evolutionary transition! Even the tuning fork, single line or scrawl markings, of the graptolyte fossils found on shales, which look like evolutionary forms, are often contemporaneous and are distinct and different structures made by similar but biologically different colonial organisms. Another problem is that nowhere in the world can the geological column be verified, for nowhere can a complete succession of strata be found. Exacerbating the problem are a number of inexplicable anomalies; e.g. in a few localities so-called older beds are sometimes interlayered between newer beds, fossil tree trunks belonging to one era transect beds above and below, which belong to earlier and later periods, etc.

Transitional Ape-Man Type Never Found

To bring the total absence of transitional fossils more into focus, consider the so-called evolution of Man from Ape in the geologically recent past. It is said that, in Miocene times about 30 million years ago, the first truly ape-like anthropoids came into existence. The first and most primitive members of this line, it is said, and from which the gibbon, orang, orang-utang, gorilla, chimp, and man were supposedly derived, were found in E. Africa. Then, less than a million years ago, it is claimed, there appeared man-like forms which were given the name of Southern Apes (*Australopithecinae*), which were nearly upright and had nearly human faces excepting for the ape ridge or lobe at the sloping brow, and these are regarded as the first hominids.

In 1857, the remains of a developed hominid of the Old Stone Age were found in a cave in the Neanderthal Valley in the Rhineland, which had a ridge of bone above its eyes, the lobe feature which denotes an ape skull. The creature had heavy round shoulders and walked with a stoop. It was acclaimed as a species representing a transition stage, more man than ape, and was given the name of Neanderthal Man. Such animals as the so-called Neanderthal Man and

the Southern Ape are now extinct, but Man (*Homo Sapiens*), as we see him now, remains the same as he ever was; for the very earliest fossil skeletons emphasize that Man has not changed in any way since primitive times — there's a total absence of creatures with genuine intermediate ape-to-man features. On scientific evidence, man is the same as he always was; never nearly-man as is claimed by evolutionists who, quite deliberately, call a beast by the name of "So-and-So-Man", as in Neanderthal Man, to imply a close relationship to Man; and are prepared to forge the evidence which is lacking.

To further their case, fake "intermediate" skulls were constructed, e.g., Swanscombe Man, Piltdown Man, Denver Man, Peking Man; all of which managed to deceive the public for a while. There never has been a single example of a genuine intermediate ape-man, yet the untold number of slight variations in the development of ape to man would have produced billions of transitional types, scattered everywhere on earth. On such manufactured evidence as this, the story of the evolution of man from ape, and that of evolution in general, was concocted. Fanciful artists' impressions and fake man-made constructions of intermediate stage skulls were used to illustrate the theory. Evolutionists, determined to reject Creation at any cost, worked on the principle of ignoring the facts whilst frequently repeating the fallacy with all the authority they could muster, and then including the dubious theory in educational and professional publications before it could be challenged by the academic community; and then proceed to act as if their theme was scientifically proven, until the intimidated general public begin to believe it. Fossil evidence for this period is plentiful and well preserved yet *not one* scientifically verifiable transition ape-man type has ever been found to attest to this theory, although a multitude of fossils belonging both to ape types and to man are freely available, often together, in the rocks. Without exception, every so-called ape-man missing link has been fraudulently conceived and accompanied by intensive propaganda, to enhance public acceptance of the theory of evolution, and often it has taken up to 40 years before the manufactured artefact was submitted to close pathological examination

and found to be a forgery; e.g., Piltdown Man was a combination of human skull and ape jaw.

Evolution Inherently Contradictory

Consider also that the theory of evolution contradicts its own fundamental theory of natural selection and survival of the fittest, in its actual preference for the extremely vulnerable naked human baby as a level of higher development from the tough and less vulnerable hairy baby ape. Another example of this inherent contradiction, amongst very many, is to be found amongst the Pterodactyl reptiles of the dinosaur period, supposedly between 65-150 million years ago. Most of these pterosaurs, the flying reptiles, were about the size of a sparrow when they first appeared on the evolutionary scene; but, as they developed, their size and body-weight progressively increased. One of the most highly developed of the species, the Pterodactyl Quetzalcoatlus, with a wingspan of about 50 feet, or 15 metres, is the largest known winged creature. It presents evolutionists with a riddle, in their theory of natural selection and survival of the fittest. Firstly, the structural strength of the outstretched carpals and metacarpals of the long-wing skeleton is not sufficiently robust to support the dead weight of the bone and muscle tissue, without severe strain due to flexing. Secondly, the inadequate strength of the long thin bones could not have borne the great stress or bending moment of a 25 foot wing. So it had developed enormous appendages for powerful flight yet could not fly! From an evolutionary point of view:

- (a) Why did nature preferentially select this grotesque wing extension which actually prevented the functioning of the wing?
- (b) The Quetzalcoatlus was the least fit of its species, yet it was the later development. How could it represent the survival of the fittest of its species?

1980: Chicago Convention Rejects Evolution as Unscientific and Obsolete

One tenet of the evolution hypothesis is the *continuous* development of a species into higher forms, but there are

too many anomalies for this to be so. Man, the most recent species, without doubt is now seen to have failed to show any tendency to develop any features of a more advanced species. Today's coelacanth is identical to the coelacanth supposedly in existence 70 million years ago. It still has the same lung structure and strong, limb-like fins as its fossilized ancestors. The problem for the evolutionist is that it has not become an amphibian and then left the sea during this period; according to evolution theory, it should have evolved in the intervening time into the higher form of land-dweller. It is impossible for them to explain the paradox in evolutionary terms.

The fact is that evolution was a completely implausible theory and by 1970, the obvious contradictions in Darwinian evolution were leading towards its rejection by the scientific community, despite very successful efforts by humanists to maintain it as the accepted course of study in schools. By 1980, the scientific discrediting of Darwinism caused the Chicago Convention to unexpectedly reject evolution as unscientific and obsolete. But, rather than give serious consideration to the obvious alternative of Creation of species, which provides rational answers but requires an admission of the existence of a transcendent God, they foolishly proposed a more implausible thesis still. They attempted to perpetuate evolution under another guise, and turned to punctuated equilibrium.

Punctuated Equilibrium, etc., etc.

'Punctuated Equilibrium' starts with the scientific tenet that equilibrium exists in nature, and that this equilibrium will persist undisturbed; that everything in nature stays the same for a very long period of time, where parents continue to reproduce their own kind and consistently beget offspring which look like themselves, i.e., deer beget deer, etc. Quite suddenly however, in response to a change in the environmental stimuli, there is a large sudden leap in the natural development of a species, which overturns this equilibrium and, in defiance of scientific logic, a deviant offspring is born — an incredibly robust and fertile mutation better adapted to the new environment — which not only survives

but mates prodigiously with other illogical and identically healthy mutants, to produce offspring monsters like itself; and thus finally replaces the originals as the dominant type, e.g., a deer begets a robust offspring with a long neck, and that mutant mates to produce offsprings with even longer necks (i.e., giraffes), because the more nutritious leaves are to be found higher in the changed environment. This preposterous theory flies in the face of biological fact that like begets like, and that mutants are exceedingly rare, usually weak and sterile, vulnerable to predators, and often deserted by their parents. Consequently such a contentious theory was rejected by many erstwhile evolutionists, which brought the whole theory into question. Sir Francis Crick, the prominent atheist who discovered DNA, thus proposed an alternative theory of the beginning of lifeforms. With conviction he said, "Life could not possibly have begun on earth from lifeless matter", and then claimed that the only possible option was that, "Seeds of intelligent life were transmitted from an advanced civilisation in outer space". In accepting this ludicrous theory, one surely would then ask: But where did the spacemen in this advanced civilisation themselves get life?

Professor Watson, humanist and member of the British Society, concedes, "The theory of evolution is universally accepted, not because it can be proved, but the only alternative is special creation which is clearly incredible!"

Genetic Variants

No two living organisms can ever be identical, for this kind of precise duplication can only occur in inanimate objects which are subject to the constraints of strict physical laws; and, since earliest recorded times, many physically different variants of colour, size, etc., in each species have existed, e.g., large and small, brown and black dogs, etc.; and the pattern and variety of those variants proliferate as genes are mixed in the division of chromosomes of each new generation. The only exception to this rule of proliferation is when men interfere with nature and bring about selective breeding. These variations within the species, in terms of height, keenness of sight or hearing, ability to with-

stand heat or cold, etc., are genetic in origin and could not be produced in individuals in response to purely environmental factors. If presumptions must be made, it is surely more logical to turn the argument around, and presume that in any individual species we care to name, the genetic variations already existed from the beginning; and, as the climatic changes occurred, some of these variants migrated, as birds and fish still do, to an environment better suited to their own existing physical condition; whereas other variants of the same species stayed where they were, despite climatic changes, because they found themselves still able to thrive in the changed environment. Those unfortunates, unable to migrate and yet unable to survive in this new and alien environment, would quickly die out; leaving behind, in that particular place, only those variants of their species with mutually similar physical attributes, which protected them and aided their survival. Then would follow a slow learning process where these survivors would adapt their habits and learn new skills, and would become so completely identified and integrated with those climatic and environmental conditions that they would seem to the most careful observer to have actually evolved there, in direct response to the local environment.

In other words, the vast range of animal and plant life we see today, plus those lifeforms now extinct, could have been distributed throughout the globe at the beginning of life on earth — perhaps fossil graveyards, apparently representing animal life from widely dispersed geological periods, indicate that many species originally inhabited the earth at the same time. Many would die out as the local environment radically changed and could no longer support them; as occurred in the extensive polar ice sheets of glacial times which caused animals to migrate southwards or die (Woolly Elephant). In addition if continental drift can be justified, then the break up of the original single continent of Pangaea would isolate many animals (Australian marsupials); and, in moving Europe from tropical to temperate regions on the earth's surface, the extreme climatic transfer would exterminate many species. So it is reasonable to presume that many more species existed in the past than we see today and this is supported by geological observations, e.g., fossils

of coal that measure plants include a broad range of mono and dicotyledons and a great abundance of ferns, most of which are now extinct.

No New Species During Man's History

As a species died out, or simply declined in numbers as a consequence of climatic change and other environmental factors, another species would prosper at its expense and grow in numbers and varieties, e.g., the predatory cat family in Africa increased in number as the competition of the larger predators died out, or the vulnerable kangaroo of Australia became less vulnerable as its predators became extinct. On the other hand, in a continuing process of evolution, most species would be passing unceasingly and progressively through all evolutionary stages; or, if punctuated equilibrium is the favoured thesis, they would maintain their present state and then allow a new species to occasionally punctuate this equilibrium by suddenly emerging somewhere on the Earth's surface. Nature tends always to maintain a balance, yet, although there are ample records of many species dying out, it is interesting to note that apparently no new species have either suddenly evolved or have been in process of discernible change during man's history. The birth of a new species, or even a radical and sudden change in existing species, would have been a matter for comment, and being noticed, a record would certainly have been made of such an amazing development, perhaps as a neolithic drawing on some prehistoric cave wall. Man certainly recorded the animals or plants he saw around him.

Problem Remains

Since animals became extinct during recorded times, the evidence certainly suggests a diminishing number of species throughout man's history rather than the increase in the total range which an evolutionary process would produce. Some problems do however remain, and three of these will show the extent of the difficulties in explaining Creation theory in relation to the Earth:

- (1) Fossil evidence from archaean times does not show the existence at that time of modern animals, although some

prehistoric life still persists (e.g., coelacanth) from the distant past. Yet, if many present and extinct animals really coexisted from the beginning of life on earth, present day animals should be fossilized in large numbers and side by side with those of the past, yet they are absent.

(2) Fossils lie in strata on very high mountain ranges which appear to have sedimented in prehistoric lakes and seas, perhaps millions of years ago. So, unless some credible flood theory could be made to account for it, the time scale must be very large. In addition, fossils are often specific to one or two eras and appear to have died out at the end of those eras, so they are actually used as markers to identify a particular geological period. It seems evident therefore that the geological eras do define the limits of a particular climatic period of time, and appear to represent a reasonably accurate measure of a great timespan. Yet there are fossil "graveyards" where fossil types, supposedly separated by hundreds of millions of years, are all jumbled together, as if they had all been drowned together at the same time.

(3) Man certainly appears to have started life at a later date than all other life; and, in addition, all forms of life appear to have come into existence as a progression from lower to higher life forms. It also seems evident that the arrival of anthropoid apes on earth immediately preceded the appearance of man. In the absence therefore of a belief in the supernatural separation of man from beast, the atheist is bound to try to make a connection between ape and man; and it is on this natural level of argument that evolution must be contested and be shown to be misleading.

Creation theorists must therefore accept the probability that creation of the Earth was in well-defined stages over a vast time scale, not necessarily corresponding to the literal Bible stages. Last of all would be the special creation of man in God's own image.

Book Reviews

MULIER FORTIS

Judith's Marriage by Bryan Houghton; Credo House, P.O. Box 7049, Evanston, Illinois 60204, U.S.A.; pp. 232; \$15.95.

No skit, this. In no way. Rather, a pastiche that portrays in prose that is a pleasure to read for its own sake, the appalling and quite unnecessary suffering that has been thrust on so many of the Faithful these past twenty years in the name of a reform that has passed, long since, into mounting revolution. What you have now within the Church is not renewal but destruction. And you cannot renew that which has been destroyed. You have to go back to what it was before the destruction and start again from there. There is no other way. This is what traditionalists see so clearly. This is what progressive revolutionaries refuse to see. Where they are concerned, there can be no return to the origins. So to do would be to admit failure, bringing their way the one thing they dread more than anything else. This they see as the ensuing loss of face which such a return on their part would bring to themselves. This they fear understandably, from their own point of view, for this would leave them stranded, alone, outside the revolutionary tide with nowhere to go. Away from the companionship of the revolutionary pack which gives reason to their progressive existence.

They are best seen, I believe, these progressive revolutionaries within the Church today, as running from the failure that they see as overshadowing their revolutionary efforts; their endeavour to make the Church anew in their own secularist likeness. Their running takes the form of immersion in increasingly frenetic efforts at further change. We have reached the point where progress for them amounts to little more than change for its own sake. As with all revolutions, that within the Church is about to exhaust itself, exchanging its original dynamic for the tick-over that heralds stagnation. It has been well said that all

revolutions die in their first moment of seeming triumph. That within the Church has passed that first moment. From the tick-over that is steadily taking over the original seeming triumph of their revolution, the progressive revolutionaries are striving somewhat desperately to save it and themselves through further change, introduced now and largely for its own sake, without any defined objective. The medium is fact becoming the message. This means that the revolution is coming to its end, dying, you might say, of a surfeit of its own empty verbiage.

During its rampaging years the damage has been fearful. To understand how fearful, you can either take a case-history—in this case the story of Judith the convert and her marriage, told with such sensitivity by Father Bryan Houghton; or you can study in broad sweep the statistics and the facts, which are shattering. Better still, you can do both. But, I would say this—if you study the statistics and facts, set out on however broad a canvas, and leave out the case history, you will have deprived yourself of a great deal. Particularly, in the case of Father Houghton's beautifully phrased, incisive novel. Those who have had the pleasure of reading *Mitre and Crook*—his first essay in this direction—will know what I mean. What it comes to is this; reading what Father Houghton has to say, you *know* that what he is saying is true; that he has a truly penetrating understanding of what so many in the Church have been and are now going through at the moment and at the hands of those within the Church who are in a position to support them and who should be doing so; but are not doing it. This kind of writing can only come from one who is not only a fine priest, but a man of the world in the best and most objective sense of that phrase, if I may put it that way. Father Houghton knows and understands because he has given himself generously and with understanding to others for God's sake and because he sees it quite rightly as something a priest is meant to do and should do. There is nothing "pi" about this book. There is everything that is splendidly and triumphantly about the Faith in it. Encapsulated within its two hundred and thirty pages is a story of love and tragedy and hope knit round sterling faith and told with an economy of phrase and a limpid simplicity of

style that makes it not merely a delight, but a veritable tonic to read.

You will gather from what I have said that it is most warmly commended to readers. Indeed, it most certainly is.

—Paul Crane, S.J.

SHORTS

Rightly enough, a good crop of pamphlet and, indeed, booklet material has appeared lately to mark the Marian Year. So far as I can make out—and I hope sincerely that I am wrong—very little appears to have been done at local diocesan level throughout the Church to mark this great occasion. It could well be that, for far too many clergy and Religious, the claims of what they think of wrongly as ecumenism preclude “undue” honour being paid to the Mother of God. This foolishness I find it very hard to forgive, the more so when measured against the persistent devotion of so many of the Faithful. It is for these lay men and women, always so faithful, that I would recommend these pamphlets. They will take from their perusal the encouragement that reassurance always brings.

The Augustine Printing Company, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL must be given pride of place when it comes to pamphlet-publication in this Marian Year. At the top of the list—with the recommendation that English readers in particular should get hold of it — I would place Canon Francis Ripley's, *Mary in Medieval England*. Strength for the future can come from a thoughtful — and, indeed, prayerful—reading of England's Catholic past, where the Mother of God is concerned. After this fine piece of writing, there are more pamphlets which are well worth a read, along with thought and a prayer. Here they are as follows: *Bala Lake Shrine* by Pererin, *Glimpses of Old Catholic England* by T. S. Westbrook, *Fatima and the Last Times* by Brother Michael de la Trinite (a bit shattering, this, but with a ring of objective truth that runs through its pages), *Mary Immaculate in the Writings of St. Maximilian Kolbe* (Poland's heroic martyr-saint), then, lastly and, like all the above, published by the Augustine Publishing Co., *Mother of God: Mary in Scripture and Tradition* by Rev. Cyril

Papali, ODC. This is as good an introduction as you will get to Marian spirituality. It carries an Introduction by the late Frank Duff, Founder of the Legion of Mary. Prices are not given on most of these pamphlets. Send your inquiries, please, not to me, but to the Augustine Publishing Company at the address given above.

I should mention now more pamphlets of excellent content and handy size, published by the Irish Messenger Office, 37 Lower Leeson Street, Dublin 2, Ireland. *Prayers for the Marian Year* is the first to take note of. For the rest, the titles tell their contents well enough to know that each of them is a good buy. The latest I have received are as follows: *Parents' Problems* by Fr. Paul Andrews, S.J.; *Reflective Living* by Fr. Brian Grogan, S.J.; *Saint Margaret Mary* by Fr. Edmund Murphy, S.J. The price of each of these is round the 40p to 50p mark. It would be advisable to write for a list.

Lastly, a clutch of booklets and near-booklets, excellently produced and reasonably enough priced, each dealing with a subject that is vital enough today. At the top of the list I would place *The Gift of Life and Love* by Dr. John J. Billings, MD, which carries a Foreword by Cardinal Gagnon. It sells at £1.25 a single copy, including postage, or £10 for 12 copies, also including postage. It is published by The Apostolate of Catholic Truth, 3 Mooreside Avenue, Ribblesdale, Preston PR2 8LU, Lancs. Next, *Drugs: How the Church can Help* by Father Mark T. Elvins, a Catholic priest, and Teresa Searle, a Catholic and a lawyer. A good combination, I reckon, to deal with such a subject. They deal with it well. It is published by McCrimmon Publishing Co. Ltd., 10-12 High St., Great Wakering, Essex SS3 0EQ. Price on inquiry. Averil Smith has edited thirteen talks given at conferences under the auspices of the Christian Affirmation Campaign from 1974-1986. The talks have worn with time very well indeed, as is the way with good stuff. These talks are very good stuff indeed. They are published by Christian Heritage Publications, 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, Sussex BN11 4DP. Again, price on inquiry.

—Paul Crane, S.J.